

THE
WAR IN TEXAS;
A
REVIEW OF FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES,
SHOWING THAT
THIS CONTEST IS THE RESULT
OF A LONG PREMEDITATED
CRUSADE AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT,
SET ON FOOT BY
Slaveholders, Land Speculators, &c.
WITH THE VIEW OF
RE-ESTABLISHING, EXTENDING, AND PERPETUATING
THE SYSTEM OF
SLAVERY AND THE SLAVE TRADE
IN THE
REPUBLIC OF MEXICO.

BY A CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES.

PHILADELPHIA:
PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,
BY MERRIHEW AND GUNN,
No. 7, Carters' Alley.

.....
1836.

The subject of the following pages—the original cause of the present contest in Texas—having long occupied the vigilant attention of the writer; and as it has recently assumed a character of *ominous importance*, in the view of philanthropists generally, he feels a deep and anxious solicitude that the facts herein presented may be widely circulated, and duly considered by all concerned in the maintenance of Constitutional Liberty, the preservation of our free republican form of government, and the promotion of the sacred cause of humanity. This treatise first appeared in several successive numbers of the “*National Enquirer*,” a Weekly Paper recently established in the city of Philadelphia; and it is now issued in pamphlet form, in order that it may be more convenient for reference, and the perusal of such as take an interest in the momentous question with which it is connected. The whole was prepared for the press rather too hastily for strict methodical arrangement; yet it is to be hoped that its various topics will be found so distinctly, if not regularly classified, as to be easily comprehended by every attentive reader.

TO JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, }
 DANIEL WEBSTER, } *of Massachusetts;*
 WM. ELLERY CHANNING, }
 WILLIAM SLADE, *of Vermont;*
 JAMES TALLMADGE, }
 WILLIAM JAY, } *of New York;*
 GERRIT SMITH, }
 THEODORE FRELINGHUYSEN, *of New Jersey;*
 JOHN SERGEANT, }
 MATTHEW CAREY, } *of Pennsylvania;*
 CHARLES MINER, }
 HEZEKIAH NILES, } *of Maryland;*
 DANIEL RAYMOND, }
 ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, *of Virginia;*
 BENJAMIN RUGGLES, } *of Ohio;*
 CHARLES HAMMOND, }
 JOHN FINLEY CROW, *of Indiana;*
 EDWARD COLES, *of Illinois;*
 JAMES H. DICKEY, *of Kentucky;*
 DAVID HOYT, *of Tennessee;*

This treatise is respectfully inscribed,

BY THE AUTHOR.

These gentlemen are likewise hereby severally called upon, with all others of kindred sentiments, patriotism, and philanthropy, and are most urgently solicited to step forth upon the present extremely important occasion, and exert their talents and commanding influence in promoting the cause of humanity, and in preserving the peace and the honor of their country, by awakening the public attention to the enormity of this wanton aggression, this violation of the integrity of a neighboring nation, by the southern slaveholders and their unprincipled co-operators.

THE WAR IN TEXAS.

It is generally admitted, that the war in Texas has assumed a character which must seriously affect both the interests and the honour of this nation. It implicates the conduct of a large number of our citizens, and even the policy and measures of the government are deeply involved in it. The subject, as now presented to our view, is indeed one of vital importance to the people of the United States; and it particularly invites the attention—the most solemn and deliberate consideration—of all who profess to be guided by the true principles of justice and philanthropy. It is not only to be viewed as a matter of interest, at the present day. The great fundamental principles of universal liberty—the perpetuity of our free republican institutions—the prosperity, the welfare, and the happiness of future generations—are measurably connected with the prospective issue of this fierce and bloody conflict.

But the prime cause, and the real objects of this war, are not distinctly understood by a large portion of the honest, disinterested, and well-meaning citizens of the United States. Their means of obtaining correct information upon the subject have been necessarily limited; and many of them have been deceived and misled, by the misrepresentations of those concerned in it, and especially by hireling writers for the newspaper press. They have been induced to believe that the inhabitants of Texas were engaged in a legitimate contest for the maintenance of the sacred principles of Liberty, and the natural, inalienable Rights of Man:—whereas, the motives of its instigators, and their chief incentives to action, have been, from the commencement, of a directly opposite character and tendency. *It is susceptible of the clearest demonstration, that the immediate cause and the leading object of this contest originated in a settled de-*

sign, among the slaveholders of this country, (with land-speculators and slave-traders,) to wrest the large and valuable territory of Texas from the Mexican Republic, in order to re-establish the SYSTEM OF SLAVERY; to open a vast and profitable SLAVE-MARKET therein; and, ultimately, to annex it to the United States. And further, it is evident—nay, it is very generally acknowledged—that the insurrectionists are principally citizens of the United States, who have proceeded thither for the purpose of revolutionizing the country; and that they are dependant upon this nation, for both the physical and pecuniary means, to carry the design into effect. We have a still more important view of the subject. The Slaveholding Interest is now paramount in the Executive branch of our national government; and its influence operates, indirectly, yet powerfully, through that medium, in favour of this Grand Scheme of Oppression and Tyrannical Usurpation. Whether the national Legislature will join hands with the Executive, and lend its aid to this most unwarrantable, aggressive attempt, will depend on the VOICE OF THE PEOPLE, expressed in their primary assemblies, by their petitions, and through the ballot-boxes.

The writer of this has long viewed, with intense anxiety, the clandestine operations of this unhallowed scheme, and frequently warned the public of the danger to be apprehended, in case of its success. He has carefully noted the preparatory arrangements for its consummation—the combination of influence—the concentration of physical power—the organization of various means—and, finally, the undissembled prosecution of it, by overt acts of violence and bloodshed:—and he now stands pledged to prove, by the exhibition of well attested

facts and documentary evidence, that the original cause, the principal object, and the nature of the contest, are what he has, above, represented them to be. As a preliminary to this exposition, the speech of John Quincy Adams, delivered in the House of Representatives of the United States, December 25th, 1835, is commended to the notice of the reader.—Speaking of the constitutional powers of Congress, relative to the subject of slave emancipation, and supposing several cases that may be likely to occur, he proceeds as follows :—

“I suppose a more portentous case, certainly within the bounds of possibility—I would to God I could say not within the bounds of probability. You have been, if you are not now, at the very point of a war with Mexico—a war, I am sorry to say, so far as public rumour is credited, stimulated by provocations on our part from the very commencement of this Administration down to the recent authority given to General Gaines to invade the Mexican territory. It is said that one of the earliest acts of this Administration was a proposal made at a time when there was already much ill-humour in Mexico against the United States, that she should cede to the U. States a very large portion of her territory—large enough to constitute nine States equal in extent to Kentucky. It must be confessed that a device better calculated to produce jealousy, suspicion, ill-will, and hatred, could not have been contrived. It is further affirmed that this overture, offensive in itself, was made precisely at the time when a swarm of colonists from these United States were covering the Mexican border with land-jobbing, and with slaves, introduced in defiance of the Mexican laws, by which slavery had been abolished throughout that Republic. The war now raging in Texas is a Mexican civil war, and a war for the re-establishment of slavery where it was abolished. It is not a servile war, but a war between slavery and emancipation, and every possible effort has been made to drive us into the war, on the side of slavery.

It is, indeed, a circumstance eminently fortunate for us that this monster, Santa Anna, has been defeated and taken,* though I cannot participate in that exquisite joy with which we have been told that every one having Anglo-Saxon blood in his veins must have been delighted on hearing that this ruffian has been shot, in cold blood, when a prisoner of war, by the Anglo-Saxon leader of the victo-

rious Texian army. Sir, I hope there is no member of this House, of other than Anglo-Saxon origin, who will deem it uncourteous that I, being myself in part Anglo-Saxon, must, of course, hold that for the best blood that ever circulated in human veins. Oh! yes, sir! far be it from me to depreciate the glories of the Anglo-Saxon race; although there have been times when they bowed their necks and submitted to the law of conquest, beneath the ascendancy of the Norman race. But, sir, it has struck me as no inconsiderable evidence of the spirit which is spurring us into this war of aggression, of conquest, and of slave-making, that all the fires of ancient, hereditary national hatred are to be kindled, to familiarize us with the ferocious spirit of rejoicing at the massacre of prisoners in cold blood. Sir, is there not yet hatred enough between the races which compose your Southern population and the population of Mexico, their next neighbour, but you must go back eight hundred or a thousand years, and to another hemisphere, for the fountains of bitterness between you and them? What is the temper of feeling between the component parts of your own Southern population, between your Anglo-Saxon, Norman French, and Moorish Spanish inhabitants of Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Missouri? between them all and the Indian savage, the original possessor of the land from which you are scourging him already back to the foot of the Rocky Mountains? What between them all and the American negro, of African origin, whom they are holding in cruel bondage? Are these elements of harmony, concord, and patriotism between the component parts of a nation starting upon a crusade of conquest? And what are the feelings of all this motley compound equally heterogeneous of the Mexican population? Do not you, an Anglo-Saxon, slave-holding exterminator of Indians, from the bottom of your soul, hate the Mexican-Spaniard-Indian emancipator of slaves and abolisher of slavery? And do you think that your hatred is not with equal cordiality returned? Go to the city of Mexico, ask any one of your fellow-citizens who have been there for the last three or four years, whether they scarcely dare show their faces, as Anglo-Americans, in the streets. Be assured, sir, that, however heartily you detest the Mexican, his bosom burns with an equally deep-seated detestation of you.

And this is the nation with which, at the instigation of your Executive Government, you are now rushing into war—into a war of conquest; commenced by aggression on your part, and for the re-establishment of slavery, where it has been abolished, throughout the Mexican Republic. For your war will be with Mexico—with a Republic of twenty-four States, and a population of eight or nine

* Mr. Adams, and many others, have been misled by false representations respecting Santa Anna's character.

millions of souls. It seems to be considered that this victory over twelve hundred men, with the capture of their commander, the President of the Mexican Republic, has already achieved the conquest of the whole Republic. That it may have achieved the independence of Texas, is not impossible. But Texas is to the Mexican Republic not more nor so much as the State of Michigan is to yours. That State of Michigan, the People of which are in vain claiming of you the performance of that sacred promise you made them, of admitting her as a State into the Union; that State of Michigan, which has greater grievances and heavier wrongs to allege against you for a declaration of her independence, if she were disposed to declare it, than the People of Texas have for breaking off their union with the Republic of Mexico. Texas is an extreme boundary portion of the Republic of Mexico; a wilderness only inhabited by the Indians until after the Revolution which separated Mexico from Spain; not sufficiently populous at the organization of the Mexican Confederacy to form a State by itself, and therefore united with Coahuila, where the greatest part of the indigenous part of the population reside. Sir, the history of all the emancipated Spanish American colonies has been, ever since their separation from Spain, a history of convulsory wars; of revolutions, accomplished by single, and often very insignificant battles; of chieftains, whose title to power has been the murder of their immediate predecessors. They have all partaken of the character of the first conquest of Mexico by Cortez, and of Peru by Pizarro; and this, sir, makes me shudder at the thought of connecting our destinies indissolubly with theirs. It may be that a new revolution in Mexico will follow upon this captivity or death of their President and commanding general; we have rumours, indeed, that such a revolution had happened even before his defeat; but I cannot yet see my way clear to the conclusion that either the independence of Texas, or the capture and military execution of Santa Anna, will save you from war with Mexico. Santa Anna was but one of a breed of which Spanish America for the last twenty-five years has been a teeming mother—soldiers of fortune, who, by the sword or the musket ball have risen to supreme power, and by the sword or the musket ball have fallen from it. That breed is not extinct; the very last intelligence from Peru tells of one who has fallen there as Yturbe, and Mina, and Guerrero, and Santa Anna have fallen in Mexico. The same soil which produced them is yet fertile to produce others. They reproduce themselves, with nothing but a change of the name and of the man. Your war, sir, is to be a war of races—the Anglo-Saxon American pitted against the Moorish-

Spanish-Mexican American; a war between the Northern and Southern halves of North America, from Passamaquoddy to Panama. Are you prepared for such a war?

And again I ask, what will be your *cause* in such a war? Aggression, conquest, and the re-establishment of slavery where it has been abolished. In that war, sir, the banners of *freedom* will be the banners of Mexico; and your banners, I blush to speak the word, will be the banners of slavery.

Sir, in considering these United States and the Mexican States as mere masses of power coming to collision against each other, I cannot doubt that Mexico will be the greatest sufferer by the shock. The conquest of all Mexico would seem to be no improbable result of the conflict, especially if the war should extend no farther than to the two mighty combatants. But will it be so confined? Mexico is clearly the weakest of the two Powers, but she is not the least prepared for action. She has the more recent experience of war. She has the greatest number of veteran warriors; and although her highest chief has just suffered a fatal and ignominious defeat, yet that has happened often before to leaders of armies too confident of success and contemptuous of their enemy.—Even now, Mexico is better prepared for a war of invasion upon you than you are for a war of invasion upon her. There may be found a successor to Santa Anna, inflamed with the desire, not only of avenging her disaster, but what he and his nation will consider your perfidious hostility. The national spirit may go with him. He may not only turn the tables upon the Texian conquerors, but drive them for refuge within your borders, and pursue them into the heart of your own territories. Are you in a condition to resist him? Is the success of your whole army, and all your veteran generals, and all your militia-calls, and all your mutinous volunteers against a miserable band of five or six hundred invisible Seminole Indians, in your late campaign, an earnest of the energy and vigor with which you are ready to carry on that far otherwise formidable and complicated war?—complicated, did I say? And how complicated? Your Seminole war is already spreading to the Creeks, and, in their march of desolation, they sweep along with them your negro slaves, and put arms into their hands to make common cause with them against you, and how far will it spread, sir, should a Mexican invader, with the torch of liberty in his hand, and the standard of freedom floating over his head, proclaiming emancipation to the slave and revenge to the native Indian, as he goes, invade your soil? What will be the condition of your States of Louisiana, of Mississippi, of Alabama, of Arkansas, of Missouri, and of Georgia? Where

will be your negroes? Where will be that combined and concentrated mass of Indian tribes, whom, by an inconsiderate policy, you have expelled from their widely distant habitations, to embody them within a small compass on the very borders of Mexico, as if on purpose to give that country a nation of natural allies in their hostilities against you? Sir, you have a Mexican, an Indian, and a negro war upon your hands, and you are plunging yourself into it blindfold; you are talking about acknowledging the independence of the Republic of Texas, and you are thirsting to annex Texas, ay, Coahuila, and Tamaulipas, and Santa Fe, from the source to the mouth of the Rio Bravo, to your already over-distended dominions. Five hundred thousand square miles of the territory of Mexico would not even now quench your burning thirst for aggrandizement.

But will your foreign war for this be with Mexico alone? No, sir. As the weaker party, Mexico, when the contest shall have once begun, will look abroad, as well as among your negroes and your Indians, for assistance. Neither Great Britain nor France will suffer you to make such a conquest from Mexico; no, nor even to annex the independent State of Texas to your Confederation, without their interposition. You will have an Anglo-Saxon intertwined with a Mexican war to wage. Great Britain may have no serious objection to the independence of Texas, and may be willing enough to take her under her protection, as a barrier both against Mexico and against you. But, as aggrandizement to you she will not readily suffer it; and, above all, she will not suffer you to acquire it by conquest and the re-establishment of slavery. Urged on by the irresistible, overwhelming torrent of public opinion, Great Britain has recently, at a cost of one hundred millions of dollars, which her People have joyfully paid, abolished slavery throughout all her colonies in the West Indies. After setting such an example, she will not—it is impossible that she should—stand by and witness a war for the re-establishment of slavery where it had been for years abolished, and situated thus in the immediate neighborhood of her islands. She will tell you, that if you must have Texas as a member of your Confederacy, it must be without the trammels of slavery, and if you will wage a war to handcuff and fetter your fellow-man, she will wage the war against you to break his chains. Sir, what a figure, in the eyes of mankind, would you make, in deadly conflict with Great Britain: she fighting the battles of emancipation, and you the battles of slavery; she the benefactress, and you the oppressor, of human kind! In such a war, the enthusiasm of emancipation, too, would unite vast numbers of her People in aid of the national

rivalry, and all her natural jealousy against our aggrandizement. No war was ever so popular in England as that war would be against slavery, the slave-trade, and the Anglo-Saxon descendant from her own loins.

As to the annexation of Texas to your Confederation, for what do you want it? Are you not large and unwieldy enough already? Do not two millions of square miles cover surface enough for the insatiate rapacity of your land jobbers? I hope there are none of them within the sound of my voice. Have you not Indians enough to expel from the land of their fathers' sepulchres, and to exterminate? What, in a prudential and military point of view, would be the addition of Texas to your domain? It would be weakness, and not power. Is your southern and southwestern frontier not sufficiently extensive? not sufficiently feeble? not sufficiently defenceless? Why are you adding regiment after regiment of dragoons to your standing army? Why are you struggling, by direction and by indirection, to raise *per saltum* that army from less than six to more than twenty thousand men? Your commanding General, now returning from his excursion to Florida, openly recommends the increase of your Army to that number. Sir, the extension of your sea coast frontier from the Sabine to the Rio Bravo would add to your weakness tenfold; for now it is only weakness with reference to Mexico. It would then be weakness with reference to Great Britain, to France, even perhaps to Russia, to every naval European Power, which might make a quarrel with us for the sake of settling a colony; but above all, to Great Britain. She, by her naval power, and by her American colonies, holds the keys of the gulf of Mexico. What would be the condition of your frontier from the mouth of the Mississippi to the mouth of the Rio del Norte, in the event of a war with Great Britain? Sir, the reasons of Mr. Monroe for accepting the Sabine as the boundary were three.—First, he had no confidence in the strength of our claim as far as the Rio Bravo; secondly, he thought it would make our union so heavy that it would break into fragments by its own weight; thirdly, he thought it would protrude a long line of sea coast, which, in our first war with Great Britain, she might take into her own possession, and which we should be able neither to defend nor recover. At that time there was no question of slavery or of abolition involved in the controversy. The country belonged to Spain; it was a wilderness, and slavery was the established law of the land. There was then no project for carving out nine States, to hold eighteen seats in the other wing of this capitol, in the triangle between the mouths and the sources of the Mississippi and Bravo rivers. But what was our claim? Why it was that La

Salle, having discovered the mouth of the Mississippi, and France having made a settlement at New Orleans, France had a right to one-half the sea coast from the mouth of the Mississippi to the next Spanish settlement, which was Vera Cruz. The mouth of the Rio Bravo was about half way from the Balize to Vera Cruz; and so as grantees, from France of Louisiana, we claimed the Rio del Norte, though the Spanish settlement of Santa Fe was at the head of that river. France, from whom we had received Louisiana, utterly disclaimed ever having even raised such a pretension. Still we made the best of the claim that we could, and finally yielded it for the Floridas, and for the line of the 42d degree of latitude from the source of the Arkansas river to the South sea. Such was our claim; and you may judge how much confidence Mr. Monroe could have in its validity. The great object and desire of the country then was to obtain the Floridas. It was Gen. Jackson's desire; and in that conference with me to which I have heretofore alluded, and which it is said he does not recollect, he said to me that so long as the Florida rivers were not in our possession, there could be no safety for our whole Southern country.

But, sir, suppose you should annex Texas to these United States; another year would not pass before you would have to engage in a war for the conquest of the Island of Cuba. What is now the condition of the Island?—Still under the nominal protection of Spain. And what is the condition of Spain herself? Consuming her own vitals in a civil war for the succession of the crown. Do you expect, that whatever may be the issue of that war, she can retain even the nominal possession of Cuba? After having lost *all* her continental colonies in North and South America, Cuba will stand in need of more efficient protection; and above all, the protection of a naval power. Suppose that naval power should be Great Britain. There is Cuba at your very door; and if you spread yourself along a naked coast, from the Sabine to the Rio Bravo, what will be your relative position towards Great Britain, with not only Jamaica, but Cuba, and Porto Rico in her hands, and abolition for the motto to her union cross of St. George and St. Andrew? Mr. Chairman, do you think I am treading on fantastic grounds? Let me tell you a piece of history, not far remote. Sir, many years have not passed away since an internal revolution in Spain subjected that country and her king for a short time to the momentary government of the Cortes. That revolution was followed by another, by which, under the auspices of a French army with the Duke d'Angouleme at their head, Ferdinand the VII was restored to a despotic throne; Cuba had followed the fortunes of the Cortes when

they were crowned with victory; and when the counter revolution came, the inhabitants of the island, uncertain what was to be their destination, were for some time in great perplexity what to do for themselves. Two considerable parties arose in the island, one of which was for placing it under the protection of Great Britain, and another was for annexing it to the confederation of these United States. By one of these parties I have reason to believe that overtures were made to the Government of Great Britain. By the other *I know* that overtures were made to the Government of the United States. And I further know that secret, though irresponsible assurances were communicated to the then President of the United States, as coming from the French Government, that *they* were secretly informed that the British Government had determined to take possession of Cuba. Whether similar overtures were made to France herself, I do not undertake to say; but that Mr. George Canning, then the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, was under no inconsiderable alarm, lest under the pupilage of the Duke d'Angouleme, Ferdinand the VII might commit to the commander of a French naval squadron the custody of the Moro Castle, is a circumstance also well known to me. It happened that just about that time a French squadron of considerable force was fitted out and received sailing orders for the West Indies, without formal communication of the fact to the British Government; and that as soon as it was made known to him, he gave orders to the British Ambassador at Paris to demand, in the most peremptory tone, what was the destination of that squadron, and a special and positive disclaimer that it was intended even to visit the Havana; and this was made the occasion of mutual explanations, by which Great Britain, France, and the United States, not by the formal solemnity of a treaty, but by the implied engagement of mutual assurances of intention, gave pledges of honour to each other, that neither of them should in the then condition of the island take it, or the Moro Castle, as its citadel, from the possession of Spain. This engagement was on all sides faithfully performed; but, without it, who doubts that from that day to this either of the three Powers might have taken the island and held it in undisputed possession?

At this time circumstances have changed—popular revolutions both in France and Great Britain have perhaps curbed the spirit of conquest in Great Britain, and France may have enough to do to govern her kingdom of Algiers. But Spain is again convulsed with a civil war for the succession to her crown; she has irretrievably lost all her colonies on both continents of America. It is impossible that she should hold much longer a sha-

dow of dominion over the islands of Cuba and Porto Rico; nor can those islands, in their present condition, form independent nations, capable of protecting themselves. They must for ages remain at the mercy of Great Britain or of these United States, or of both; Great Britain is even now about to interfere in this war for the Spanish succession. If by the utter imbecility of the Mexican confederacy this revolt of Texas should lead immediately to its separation from that Republic, and its annexation to the United States, I believe it impossible that Great Britain should look on while this operation is performing with indifference. She will see that it must shake her own whole colonial power on this continent, in the Gulf of Mexico, and in the Caribbean seas, like an earthquake; she will see, too, that it endangers her own abolition of slavery in her own colonies. A war for the restoration of slavery where it has been abolished, if successful in Texas, must extend over all Mexico; and the example will threaten her with imminent danger of a war of colors in her own islands. She will take possession of Cuba and of Porto Rico, by cession from Spain or by the batteries from her wooden walls; and if you ask her by what authority she has done it, she will ask you, in return, by what authority you have extended your sea coast from the Sabine to the Rio Bravo. She will ask you a question more perplexing, namely—by what authority you, with freedom, independence, and democracy upon your lips, are waging a war of extermination to forge new manacles and fetters, instead of those which are falling from the hands and feet of man. She will carry emancipation and abolition with her in every fold of her flag; while your stars, as they increase in numbers, will be overcast with the murky vapors of oppression, and the only portion of your banners visible to the eye, will be the blood-stained stripes of the task master."

To give a correct detail of the plan of operations, adopted by the instigators and fomenters of this Texian war, as well as an exposition of the character and identity of those who have been the active instruments of carrying it into execution, I will commence with a brief historical narration of the settlement of the country by the Anglo-Americans. Their proceedings, in connexion with others, relative to the subject before us, will be duly noticed in the course of my remarks. In the performance of this duty, I shall make use of the information given in a series of essays, recently published in the Philadelphia "National Gazette," which will be amplified by additional

facts and illustrations, drawn from personal observation, and from numerous documents in my possession.

In reviewing the history of colonization in Texas by the Anglo-Americans, it will appear that the first regular plan adopted, was the privilege granted to Moses Austin, of Missouri, by the Spanish authorities, in the year 1820. Previous to that date, a few persons from the United States had temporarily established themselves in the eastern part of the Province, as Indian traders and unauthorized adventurers. A large tract of country was marked out on the map, and Austin was invested with the privilege of introducing three hundred families of industrious, orderly settlers, professing the Catholic religion, within a given time.—When he had obtained this grant, or privilege, he returned to Missouri, and proceeded to make the necessary preparations for carrying his colonial enterprise into effect. Before completing his arrangements, however, Moses Austin suddenly died,—and his son, Stephen F. Austin, took the business in his hands, as the legal heir and representative of his father. He soon repaired to Texas, with a considerable number of settlers, the most of whom emigrated from the states of Tennessee, Missouri, and Louisiana. But prior to his obtaining legal possession, or effecting the settlement of the families who accompanied him, the revolution occurred, which annulled the authority of the government, and resulted in the separation of all the Mexican Provinces from the Spanish Crown. The circumstances here referred to, rendered it necessary for Austin to apply to the new Government for a confirmation of his father's grant. This was obtained with little difficulty, in a modified form, and both the contractor and settlers were liberally supplied with lands, gratis, on the condition of occupying them and pledging themselves to be obedient to the laws of the country: yet the settlement of the colony was still restricted and confined to persons of the Catholic persuasion.

During the brief reign of the *Emperor* Iturbide, and the succeeding administrations of the *Federal Government*, Austin proceeded with the settlement of his col-

only, under the same regulation as before. and procured an extension of privilege to introduce settlers in other parts of Texas. Laws were enacted by the Federal Government, regulating the terms and plans of colonization;—and when the Provinces of Coahuila and Texas were united under a State Government, special regulations were made, by the legislature, in conformity with those of the general Congress, all of which were submitted to by the colonists, and binding on them.* The settlements rapidly progressed, (the terms being extremely liberal,) and Austin succeeded in fulfilling his contracts with the government, relative to the introduction of the number of settlers for which he had stipulated—receiving the *fee simple* of large tracts of land as a reward for his trouble.

The spirit of enterprise, adventure, and *speculation* was now aroused; and divers other persons obtained grants, (the privilege of introducing settlers,) with the view of colonizing the remaining vacant lands in Texas. The most prominent “*empresarios*” (contractors) were Zavala and Filasola, of Mexico; De Witt, of Missouri; Ross and Leftwich, of Tennessee; Milam, of Kentucky; Burnet, of Ohio; Thorn, of New York; Wavel and Beales, of England; Cameron, of Scotland; Vehlein, of Germany; M'Mullin, Powers, and Hewitson, of Ireland. All these entered into contracts with the government upon the same principles that Austin had done.† None of them, however, have succeeded in fulfilling their contracts, except De Witt, and Powers & Hewitson. Some of the others have introduced a part of their settlers;—but the most have disposed of their “grants” to joint stock companies, organized for the purpose, in New York and Nashville. These companies are extensively engaged in speculating with said “stock,” (and “scrip,” which they pass off as preparatory titles to land,) among the credulous, the ignorant, and the unsuspecting,

* The Colonization Law of Coahuila & Texas will be inserted, at the conclusion of this article.

† There were several others, who obtained “grants” from the State. Grant & Beales, and Soto & Egerton, were of the number; but theirs were located in Coahuila.

wherever they can find such willing to purchase. In no age or nation, perhaps, have unauthorized and illegal speculations in lands been carried to such extremes as in Texas, within the period of a few years past.† The swindling operations in the Yazoo land speculations of Mississippi, were mere child’s play in comparison. The government has thus been defrauded, and its liberal munificence abused, by the overweening and reckless spirit of avaricious adventurers. As I have before said, the terms offered by the government, to *bona fide settlers*, were of the most liberal nature throughout. They were not only authorized to select large quantities of land, and hold the same, in *fee simple*, on condition of settlement,—but they were also permitted to introduce all articles necessary for their own accommodation, for the space of ten years, free of the customary duties paid by citizens of the Republic.—This, indeed, opened a wide door for smuggling goods into the country, to supply the Indian traders, as well as the native inhabitants. The colonists did not fail to improve the opportunity; and many foreigners took lands, professedly with the view of settlement, and engaged extensively in this illicit traffic. Contraband articles—such as arms, ammunition, &c. for the savage tribes—were also introduced in great quantities whenever the vigilance of the government revenue officers could be eluded. Slaves were likewise taken in and held, in violation of the constitution and laws of the State and the decrees of the General Government.

In this state of things, propositions were made by the government of the U. States to that of Mexico, for the purchase of the Texas country, with the view of

† Sundry “grants” were also made, by the general government of Mexico, to various persons in the *Territory of Santa Fe*. These were, Dominguez; Wilson & Exter; Royuda & Beales, and Chambers. A large portion of the “grants” made to these persons, as well as those in Coahuila, have been transferred to the companies, as aforesaid, in New York—not a settler having been placed upon any of them, except that of Grant & Beales, in Coahuila—and a very few have settled there.

incorporating it into this Union. The overture was instantly rejected by the Mexican authorities, as they neither possessed the inclination nor the constitutional power to alienate any portion of the territory of the Republic. Many of the newspapers in the United States now teemed with essays and remarks, tending to urge the acquisition of Texas by any practicable means; and the agent of the government was charged with intriguing for the purpose at the Mexican Capital. The idea was also held out by the colonists, that the laws prohibiting the introduction of slaves could be easily evaded, and that they would soon be strong enough to declare and enforce the perpetuation of slavery (although it was abolished by the general and state governments) in that part of the country.—The emigration from the slaveholding States to Texas was thus accelerated, in the hope of eventually accomplishing this object. In order to counteract these efforts, the operations of the colonization system were suspended by law in the year 1830. A few troops were then sent to Texas, in addition to a small number previously stationed there, to prevent the illicit and contraband trade, the introduction of slaves, and to enforce obedience to the laws generally; but their number was insufficient for the purpose; and the regulations of the government were daringly and continually violated with impunity.

The native inhabitants of Mexico are almost to a man, opposed to slavery.—The system has been *totally* abolished in every section of the Republic, except in Texas. There it has been *prospectively* extinguished, as in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and some of the other states of this Union. But, to explain more particularly the manner in which this was effected—the Constitution of the Mexican Republic, adopted in 1824, expressly provided that no person should, thereafter, be born a slave, or introduced as such in the Mexican states; that all slaves, then held, should receive stipulated wages, and be subject to no punishment but upon trial and judgment by magistrates. The Constitution of Coahuila and Texas, promulgated on the 11th of March, 1827, also contains this important article:—

“13. In this state no person shall be born a slave after this Constitution is published in the capital of each district, and six months thereafter, neither will the introduction of slaves be permitted under any pretext.”

On the 15th of September, 1829—the Anniversary of Mexican Independence—President Guerrero, in conformity to an article in the Federal Constitution empowering him to that effect, issued a decree totally and immediately abolishing slavery throughout the Republic. A change in the administration of the government took place soon after, and representations were made to the general Congress, setting forth that many of the slaves, introduced by the Texas colonists, were so extremely ignorant as to unfit them for freedom; and a dispensation of the aforesaid decree was granted, so far only as related to Texas. The former system was, of course, revived in that particular section of the country, and the slaves introduced *previous to the year 1824*, are still legally held as *apprentices*. The colonists then adopted the plan of taking in slaves under *formal indentures*, for long periods, (in some cases for ninety-nine years,) in order to evade the law. The State Legislature passed a law, as soon as these facts were made known to it, requiring the registration of all slaves that had been legally imported, and declaring that no indenture should, in any case whatever, be obligatory upon others for a longer period than *ten years*. It was also provided, by law, that all children of persons, thus in the condition of apprentices, should be free from the control of those who held their parents, at the age of fourteen years, and be placed by the municipal authorities under the care of suitable persons, to learn some useful trade or industrious occupation, and receive a portion of common school education.

About the beginning of the year 1832, a revolution commenced in the administration of the general government of Mexico. In the course of the ensuing summer, it was consummated so far as the state of Coahuila & Texas was immediately interested, and the government troops were all compelled to leave the colonies. The foreign settlers and trad-

ers united with the party opposed to the administration, in this case; and when the troops were expelled, the custom houses were all closed in that portion of Texas which was principally inhabited by foreigners. Nothing was then in their way, to hinder them from evading every law which they chose to disregard, and many of them expressed their determination to suffer no more government troops to be stationed there in future, if they should be enabled to prevent it, under any Mexican administration. For some length of time thereafter, the political affairs of the Republic were somewhat unsettled, and the colonists in Texas were permitted to pursue their own course, subject only to the civil authority of the State. This they heeded no further than it suited their whims or their interests; and the laws, forbidding the introduction of slaves, the trade with the Indians in arms &c., and the swindling speculations in land, were considered by them as mere blank leaves in the statute book.

Among the settlers in the colonies, at this period, were some ambitious aspirants from the United States of the North, who having lost the confidence of the people in their own country, here sought a new theatre where they might press their claims to public favor and political distinction. These, with the large slaveholders, land-speculators, &c., were clamorous for the speedy adoption of measures to form a State government for Texas. The population of that particular section of the country was far less numerous than in Coahuila;—and, consequently, their influence in the state legislation, and means of obtaining lucrative offices, were very limited. All hopes of a voluntary cession of Texas to the United States by the Mexican government, were now at an end. Therefore, unless the measure of establishing an independent State, separate from any district containing a large native population could be carried into effect, their views of political aggrandizement would be thwarted, and it would also be impossible to carry out their schemes of slave-holding, &c., when the government should determine to enforce obedience to the laws. The idea was entertained, that an “independent State,” under the confederated sys-

tem, might stand upon its “sovereignty” and nullify the decrees of the general government, to suit its purposes. This doctrine was promulgated throughout the Texas country, and embraced by a considerable portion (perhaps a majority) of the colonists, who were mostly from our slave-holding States, and easily induced to believe that their pecuniary interests would be eventually promoted by the change, as proposed. Many of the substantial settlers, however, were opposed to the measure at the time. The most of those who had taken lands, and honestly engaged in improving them, evinced no desire for its speedy adoption, as the burthen of supporting a State government must fall with its heaviest weight on them; and being, generally, persons in middling or low circumstances, and having but recently established themselves in business there, they would be scarcely able to bear it. The office-seekers were principally men of little or no capital; engaged in no business enterprises; would be subject to slight taxation, if any; and, of course, they had nothing to lose, but every thing to gain, from the success of the proposed measure. And by their clamorous efforts, with the aid of the speculators and extensive slave proprietors, they succeeded at length in calling a Convention, to draft a State Constitution for Texas, in the early part of the year 1833.

The course to be pursued in the establishment of new States, either in the Territories of the Republic or by divisions of existing States, was clearly defined by the laws of the Federal Government. Certain formalities were prescribed, which required more time than was consistent with the anxious haste of the office hunters, &c. in Texas. The Convention aforesaid assembled without having been legally authorized to enter upon the performance of the duties which it assumed. A draught of a Constitution was prepared by that body, and Stephen F. Austin was deputed as the bearer of it to the capital of the Republic, to apply for its ratification by the general Congress. Although the then existing Constitution of Coahuila & Texas contained an express prohibition of slavery, as before mentioned, the subject was not even ad-

verted to in this one proposed for Texas.* For this and other reasons, the application of Austin, as agent for the Convention, was promptly rejected. To obviate the objections that were anticipated, on the score of informality in the proceedings, the Convention had instructed its agent to put in the special plea that other States had previously been admitted into the confederacy, without complying with all the formalities required by the Federal laws. But whatever might have been the inducement to dispense with the prescribed rules in other cases, the general Congress did not see fit, in this instance, to deviate therefrom; or else the other causes of objection to the Texas Constitution, were considered of themselves sufficient for the rejection of the application.

On learning the fate of their proposition, the clamors and complaints of the *movement* party in Texas, were loud and general. To preserve his popularity with that party, Austin was said to have acted very insolently towards the Federal authorities. A little difficulty, at least, occurred between them; which, however, was soon adjusted. But finding that he could not then obtain the sanction of Congress, to the measure of establishing a State Government for Texas, separate from Coahuila, he wrote to the Ayuntamiento (Council) of the municipality of San Antonio de Bexar, recommending an immediate organization, for the purpose. It is also believed that he recommended the same thing to the other municipalities in Texas. A majority of the Ayuntamiento of Bexar were native Mexicans; and they were indisposed to second the rash proposition of Austin and the reckless proceedings of some of the other colonists. Instead thereof, that body passed resolutions severely censuring this act of Austin, and sent an official statement of the whole proceedings to the Governor of Coahuila & Texas.

* Many of the colonists, and even some of the members of the Convention, openly admitted, in conversation with citizens of the United States, that it was the special *design* of the framers of that instrument, to leave it open for the re-establishment of slavery under the sovereign authority of the contemplated State Government.

He immediately communicated the same to the Federal Executive, and orders were issued for Austin's apprehension. The latter had been informed of the measures adopted by the Ayuntamiento of San Antonio de Bexar, and quitted the capital before the Executive had received the documents. A force was instantly despatched in pursuit of him, and he was overtaken at Saltillo, having merely crossed the boundary line and entered the State of Coahuila & Texas. He was forthwith remanded to the seat of government, and committed to prison, to await his trial upon a charge of treasonable conspiracy, or insubordination to the laws of the Republic.

While his case was pending, and he was thus in a state of confinement, Austin wrote to the leading politicians in Texas, advising them to desist from the further prosecution of agitating measures, and then recommended strict obedience to the laws of the country.* Many severe denunciations were uttered by them, both against the government and Austin himself—against the former, for its resolute proceedings in thwarting their insatiate ambitious designs; and against the latter, for his ill-digested and *unfortunate* measures. But not feeling themselves yet strong enough to cope with the disposable force of the nation, (the native inhabitants, even in Texas, were almost unanimously opposed to their disorganizing schemes,) they endeavoured to suppress their feelings as much as possible, and the tranquillity of the country remained undisturbed. The trial of Austin was protracted, and he continued in durance a period of nearly two years.

Some excitement was produced among the Mexicans, by the aforementioned turbulent proceedings of the Texas colonists: but as the latter did not at this period appear disposed to push their measures to further extremes, the excitement at length died away, and friendly feelings towards the foreigners were again entertained by the natives generally. The law enacted by the general Congress, in 1830, prohibiting the mi-

* The letter written by him, upon this occasion, will be inserted hereafter.

gration of citizens of the United States to Texas, was repealed in 1833; and the colonists were again admitted, upon the same liberal terms as before. The Legislature of the State of Coahuila & Texas established the trial by jury; and it also enacted that no persons in the State should be molested on account of their religious profession, be it what it might. The adjoining state of Tamaulipas, likewise guaranteed the freedom of religious opinion by law; and the popular newspaper press, throughout the republic, zealously advocated a change in the Federal Constitution, by which the free exercise of public worship, by all denominations of Christian professors, should be permanently secured.

But the spirit of "nullification" had found its way into the Mexican Confederacy. It pervaded several of the "sovereign, independent States;" and occasional attempts at insurrection in various places, were the consequence. This still prevented the Federal government from taking efficient measures to enforce the laws in Texas; and the introduction of slaves,† the unauthorized speculating in lands, and every species of smuggling and contraband trading went on as before mentioned. It was currently reported, and generally believed, that even some of the individuals at the head of the State government of Coahuila & Texas were deeply engaged in these illegal land speculations—and that immense tracts had been disposed of by them in contravention of the Federal regulations. At length the executive authorities of the republic determined to send a few troops into the Texas country, to re-establish

the custom-houses, and check the various abuses and violations of law, which had long been and were still so glaringly apparent. At this juncture, also, the Mexicans having become wearied with the disorders arising from the principles of nullification, which had taken deep root in their confederated system, a proposition was submitted for their consideration, to change their form of government to that of a consolidated Republic. Austin was finally liberated, through the clemency of the Federal authorities, and he again left the capital—having pledged himself, it was stated, to use his influence in preserving the political tranquility of Texas.

In their determination to resist the constituted authorities of the Mexican Republic, the Texas colonists calculated largely on receiving aid from the United State of the North. From the commencement of their settlement in that Province, we must bear in mind, the most of them anticipated its eventual separation from the government of Mexico, and attachment to the Northern Union. This was early resolved on by them, unless indeed other measures could be adopted for the perpetuation of slavery. A full and complete understanding existed between them and the advocates of the system in this country and elsewhere. A very active and extensive private correspondence was kept up for this purpose. Their plans were all deeply laid; and the rejection, by the Mexican government of the proposition to cede the territory in question to the United States, had no other effect than temporarily to frustrate their operations and occasion a modification of their arrangements. A vast combination was then entered into (though not *formally organized*) the ramifications of which may be traced through a great portion of the United States, and some of the British colonies, as well as the Anglo-American settlements in nearly all the north-eastern parts of Mexico. Its immediate object now is the establishment of an "Independent" government in Texas, to promote its grand ulterior designs.

As I have said before, the great land speculators, in New York and elsewhere, (consisting of individuals and companies)

† Even while the Convention, before alluded to, was in session, a slave-trader boldly landed a cargo of slaves in Texas, from Africa, via Cuba. This was such a barefaced violation of the laws of Mexico, and the treaties with other nations, that the Convention felt the necessity of passing a *formal* censure upon the conduct of the slaver. Yet some of the members warmly opposed it! and nothing was done to punish the "pirate," although it was publicly known that he was for a length of time in the country, making sale of his slaves, not far distant from where the Convention met. A short time thereafter, another similar cargo was introduced, and disposed of with like impunity.

have covered with their "grants" almost the whole area of the unsettled parts of Coahuila & Texas, and of the Territory of Santa Fe. These "grants" will nearly all soon be forfeited, as it will be impossible to introduce a sufficient number of settlers in season to comply with the terms upon which they were issued by the government. A recent act of the State Legislature prohibits the renewal of them in Coahuila & Texas; and no hope is entertained that the general Congress will further tolerate such unlimited schemes of swindling speculation, as they have heretofore facilitated.—The most strenuous exertions are therefore made to throw a population into Texas, that will favour the views of these cormorant speculators; and lands are freely offered as an inducement for the enterprising and daring to emigrate from the United States and other countries. Many such have accepted the invitation, and in numerous instances have taken lands to which they can have no rightful claim whatever, and hold the same in violation of the laws.

In case the Independence of Texas shall be established, all grants and claims, as aforesaid, are legalized, (particularly if the claimants take an active part in the revolution;) the system of slavery is to be re-established upon a firm *Constitutional* basis; and every facility will be given to the introduction of slaves from the United States, Cuba, and Africa.† This, it is confidently believed, will afford great opportunities to build up princely fortunes in the *Texian Empire*, by the sale of land, the extended traffic in slaves, &c.

It was not considered sound policy, to declare the Texas country entirely independent of Mexico, while the hope of continuing the Federal form of government existed. The colonists still felt themselves too weak to compete with the power of the republic; and it was doubtful whe-

† I have heretofore adverted to the fact, that slaves have already been introduced from Africa, by the connivance of the colonists, with perfect impunity. We have recently been informed, through the newspapers, that facilities were given to the commander of a regular slavetrading vessel (clandestinely of course,) to procure supplies at New York,

ther the auxiliary force from the United States, which they expected to co-operate with them, would be sufficient to ensure success. Besides, they were somewhat divided in opinion among themselves as to the measures that should be adopted, and the *men* who should be entrusted with the authority to direct the operations of the scheme. The most of those who marshalled as political and military leaders, were upstarts in whom they had little confidence—some of them broken down politicians and mere adventurers from the United States—persons, in fact, of very doubtful character and capacity. When the change in the form of government was proposed, therefore, they declared for the Constitution of 1824, hoping that the native citizens of the State of Coahuila & Texas, as well as those of several contiguous States, would unite with them. This would give them time at least, if successful to acquire more numerical strength to carry out their main design at a future period. But in the result of these calculations, they were totally disappointed. When it was ascertained that a large majority of the States readily sanctioned the proposition to alter the Constitution, and that every one, except Coahuila & Texas, finally acquiesced, without attempting forcible resistance, the native inhabitants of this State also gave in their adhesion, or refused to join the colonists in an insurrection.*

and proceed to his destination. And it has been more than insinuated, that persons in high official stations, deeply engaged in Texas land-speculation, were instrumental in furnishing this slaver with means to prosecute his nefarious enterprise.

* It has been asserted, that the proposal to change the form of government was made, and enforced, by the usurped authority of the President. This is not true. The measure was recommended by others, sanctioned by the general Congress, and acquiesced in by the Mexican people very generally. The Executive, as in duty bound, merely proceeds to enforce the national will. The Mexicans had become weary of the dissensions arising under the Federal organization. The "nullifiers" of that Republic acted with more spirit than those of our country. When they *resolved* to abrogate the laws of the general government, they frequently essayed to put their threats in execution; and, in too many instances, blood was shed, before

Previous to the arrival of Austin in Texas, a small number of troops reached its southern borders under General Cos. The government had not contemplated an open resistance on the part of the colonists to the re-establishment of the custom houses, the enforcement of the laws, &c, and did not send an adequate number to compel their obedience. But, true to their long settled determination, they proceeded to arrest the march of the Mexican troops into that part of the country. Austin had visited New Orleans on his way home. There the future plans of operation were concocted. He was accompanied to Texas by some daring adventurers. An army was immediately organized. Mexican revenue cutters were seized, under the charge of pirating upon the commerce of the United States in the Gulf of Mexico.† The troops under General Cos were driven into the fort at San Antonio de Bexar. Expeditions were fitted out in various parts of the United States, and auxiliary forces proceeded to the assistance of the colonists, under the guise of emigrant settlers. An agent of the Texas land speculators in New York was stationed at New Orleans, for the express purpose of forwarding these "emigrants," &c.

their disputes were settled. In the proposed amendments or alterations of their Constitution, the main essential features of a republican government were preserved; and as the form was more simple, and easier to be comprehended by the people generally, they hoped for more tranquility and permanent prosperity under it.

† The writer of this was travelling in company with a Captain of one of the U. States revenue cutters at the period here alluded to, who had been stationed on the coast of Louisiana a short time before. There were then loud complaints, in the newspapers, of the negligence of our government in protecting our commerce in the gulf of Mexico.—The Captain was questioned as to the actual state of things there. He replied as follows "These complaints proceed altogether from the smugglers. The commanders of vessels whom they denominate *pirates*, are regularly commissioned revenue officers, acting under the authority of the Mexican government. The smuggling gentry are sometimes detected, and their goods, arms, ammunition, &c. taken from them; and then they have the barefaced assurance to call upon our government to protect them in violating the Mexican laws."

Austin took the command of the colonial army, but he soon thereafter relinquished the office, leaving the Mexican troops besieged at San Antonio. He never was popular with the turbulent spirits in Texas; and they now got him out of thir way, by giving him the appointment of commissioner to procure further aid, both physical and pecuniary, from the United States.

It was now "neck or nothing" with the speculators and advocates of slavery. They could not even stand upon the basis of "State sovereignty," as a great majority of the *citizens* of Coahuila & Texas itself had agreed, tacitly at least, to the new order of things.* A fractional part only, and that almost entirely composed of foreigners, were disposed to resist for any considerable length of time, the decree of the General Congress. A meeting of some of the colonists and adventurers was held, and the incipient steps were taken to proclaim the Independence and sovereignty of Texas. It was proposed, in describing limits, to leave the western boundary undefined, in order that the contemplated new Republic might embrace as much of the Mexican territory as could be conquered. The intention of the revolutionists is, to comprehend within its limits a vast extent of country west of Texas proper, viz. parts of Coahuila and the former states of Tamaulipas and Chihuahua, as well as most of the territory of Santa Fe. The "grants" to which I have heretofore alluded, cover nearly the total surface of this extensive region, with the exception of those portions of Tamaulipas and Chihuahua, which they have in view. In fact their object is to extend the bounds of the *Texian Empire* to the Rio Bravo del Norte, at least as high up as its great

* We do not learn that more than two native Mexicans, of note, have joined the colonists and foreign adventurers, in the present insurrection. These are, Lorenzo de Zavala, and General Mexia. The first is one of the "empresarios" connected with the "Galveston Bay and Texas Land Company," of New York; and the last was banished from the Republic, I believe, on some charge of a treasonable nature. They are both deeply engaged in the land speculations before alluded to—but neither of them were residents of the State of Coahuila & Texas.

bend, where it passes through the eastern chain of the Rocky Mountains.

I will now proceed to a brief review of the "Declaration of Independence," recently issued by the Texas colonists.— But I will preface my remarks upon this particular subject, with a statement of the population of Coahuila & Texas, as far as it was correctly ascertained in the year 1832–33, immediately previous to the proposed establishment of an "Independent State" in Texas, under the Mexican Constitution of 1824. This statement is taken from official documents. The municipalities, or districts, named, comprise the population of cities or towns, with the inhabitants contiguous thereto, viz :

<i>Municipalities.</i>	<i>No. of inhabitants.</i>
Leona Vicario, (formerly Saltillo,)	24,087
Vallalonguin, - - - -	3,499
Capellania, - - - -	3,576
Parras, - - - -	11,941
Visca of Bustamenta, - - -	5,189
Monclova, - - - -	5,021
San Francisco and San Miguel de Aguays, - - - -	1,005
San Buenaventura, - - - -	4,212
Nadadores, - - - -	1,984
Cienegas, - - - -	1,631
Abasole, - - - -	1,237
Candela, - - - -	2,491
Santa Rosa, - - - -	2,334
Guerrero, - - - -	1,015
Rosas, - - - -	2,122
Nava, - - - -	569
Gigedo, - - - -	863
Morelos, - - - -	616
Allende, - - - -	678
Bexar, - - - -	1,677
Goliad, - - - -	1,439
Austin, - - - -	6,186
Nacogdoches, - - - -	834
Gonzales, (De Witt' colony,) -	466
Total, - - - -	84,672

Of these municipalities, the five last named, only, are in what was originally called the Province of Texas. The population of that of Austin, as well as Gonzales, is wholly composed of foreigners. Those of Nacogdoches, and Goliad, contain a large number of native inhabitants. In that of Bexar there are very few foreigners. The others, likewise, contain none of consequence. But although a correct census of the whole population of Texas had not been taken, and of

course the exact number was not officially ascertained, an estimate was made by an agent of the general government, commissioned for the purpose, at the period alluded to. He visited the different settlements, and obtained his information from the most intelligent colonists themselves. According to his calculation, the whole then amounted to 21,000. If we deduct the number of native inhabitants in Bexar, Goliad, and Nacogdoches (say 3,000) from this estimate, it will appear that the colonists and other foreigners in Texas, at that time, numbered about 18,000. This, it is presumed, included persons of all colours, and in all conditions, except the uncivilized Indians. We will, however, suppose that the number of foreigners themselves amounted to 20,000. The whole population of the State would thus be about 97,000. It will therefore appear, that the number of the colonists was less than one-fourth of the population: and even of that proportion a moiety, perhaps, had not taken measures to acquire legal title to citizenship. From this view of the state of things it is evident, that if the colonists could not exercise as much influence in the legislation of the State as they wished, there was a reason for it. They had their proportion of representatives in the popular branch of government, and all were governed by the same general laws. If they had sufficient cause of complaint, their views, their objects, and their supposed interests must have been very different from those of the native inhabitants of the country, to whose government they had voluntarily pledged their allegiance. But I have before stated what their views and objects were, and shall at present merely request the reader to bear the same in mind.

In pointing out some of the gross errors, or the unwarrantable assumptions, in the Declaration of Independence lately promulgated by the colonists, I will endeavour to use as much brevity as the case will permit. Passing over their preamble, our attention is directed to an enumeration of sundry grievances, the first of which are stated as follows:

"The Mexican government, by its colonization laws, invited and induced the Anglo-American population to colon-

ize its wilderness, under the pledged faith of a written constitution, that they should continue to enjoy that constitutional liberty and republican government to which they had been habituated in the land of their birth, the United States of America. In this expectation they had been cruelly disappointed—as the Mexican nation has acquiesced in the late changes made in the government by Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna;—who having overturned the constitution of this country, now offers us the cruel alternative, either to abandon our homes, acquired by so many privations, or submit to the most intolerable of all tyranny, the combined despotism of the sword and the priesthood.”

Here the idea is inculcated, that the Mexican nation solemnly pledged itself to guarantee to the colonists the same form of government that they had been accustomed to in the United States. It is true, that in organizing their government, the Mexicans adopted a plan very similar to our own. But the terms upon which they invited and permitted the settlement of foreigners were, that they must be subject to the regulations which the constituted authorities should from time to time see fit to make.

The business of colonizing commenced under the authority of the Spanish Monarchy; it was continued under the Imperial form of government, previous to the establishment of the Federal system; and every change was sanctioned by the colonists, and the declaration of their allegiance renewed, until they conceived the plan and purpose of asserting their “Independence.” Their charge against the President, of usurping authority and establishing a military despotism, is not borne out by facts. The change in the form of government was made by the representatives of the people, not by the Executive. The Constitutional Republic still exists; and we have no evidence, that, in this respect, the President exercises any authority save that with which he is invested by the laws.

They proceed to say:—“It has sacrificed our welfare to the State of Coahuila, by which our interests have been continually depressed through a jealous and partial course of legislation, carried on at

a far distant seat of government by a hostile majority in an unknown tongue; and this too, notwithstanding we have petitioned in the humblest terms for the establishment of a separate State government, and have in accordance with the provisions of the national constitution, presented to the general Congress a republican constitution, which was without just cause contemptuously rejected.”

This language is very different from that used by the colonists before they took the resolution to set up a government for themselves. That they should be disposed to complain of the transaction of legislative business in the Spanish tongue, is marvellous indeed! Had any one the folly to suppose that the natives would have adopted a foreign language, for the purpose, merely to accommodate a handful of foreign settlers? As to the “humble terms” in which they preferred their application for the privilege of establishing a State government, and the cause of rejection, I must also refer the reader to my former statements.

Alluding to Austin’s imprisonment, they gravely assert:—

“It incarcerated in a dungeon, for a long time, one of our citizens, for no other cause but a zealous endeavour to procure the acceptance of our Constitution and the establishment of a State government.”

I will leave it to the decision of every candid reader, whether the attempt to organize a State government, without the consent of the national Congress, and after that body had refused its sanction to the measure, can be fairly construed into a “zealous endeavor to procure the acceptance” of the instrument! I have before stated, particularly, the course he pursued in this case, and need not repeat it.

Proceeding with the enumeration of their “grievances,” the colonists charge the government, in their Declaration of Independence as follows:

“It has failed and refused to secure on a firm basis, the right of trial by jury, that palladium of civil liberty, and only safe guarantee for the life, liberty and property of the citizens.”

We do not learn that the general government ever officially declared, either by the Constitution or otherwise, that the "trial by jury" would be introduced in their code of laws. Yet the Mexican statesmen have evinced a disposition to establish their institutions upon the most liberal basis that the intelligence of the people and the state of things generally would permit. One of the articles of the Federal Constitution is in these words:

"160. The judicial power of each state shall be exercised by the tribunals that the Constitution may establish or designate, and all cases, civil or criminal, which appertain to the cognizance of those tribunals, shall be terminated in them to final judgment and execution."

The Spanish colonists had never been familiar with that excellent provision in the English code, the trial by jury: and as a substitute for it, the Mexican Federal Government adopted a system of *Arbitration*, which it was supposed would better comport with the habits and understandings of its citizens, at the period of the organization of the Republic. Regular Courts were established for the prompt transaction of all business connected with the judiciary: and the following articles of the Constitution guarantee the privilege of arbitration as aforesaid.

"155. No suit can be instituted, neither in civil nor criminal cases, for injuries, without [the plaintiff] being able to prove, having legally attempted the means of conciliation.

"156. None can be deprived of the right of terminating his differences by means of arbitrators appointed by each party, whatever may be the situation of the controversy."

It was understood that the States were at liberty to establish the trial by jury, when, in the opinion of the Legislatures, the state of society should warrant it. And by the Constitution of Coahuila & Texas, the principle was recognized. The two following articles of that instrument relate particularly to arbitration and trial by jury:

"178. Every inhabitant of the state can terminate his differences, be the state of the case what it may, by the medium of

arbitrators, or in any other extra-judicial manner; the agreement in this particular shall be religiously observed, and the sentence of the arbitrators executed if the parties who have made the compromise do not reserve the right of appeal."

"192. One of the principal subjects for the attention of Congress, [State Legislature,] shall be to establish in criminal cases, the Trial by Jury, extending it gradually, and even adopting it in civil cases, in proportion as the advantages of this precious institution, may be practically developed."

In order to carry out the principle alluded to in the last article here quoted, the Legislature passed an act in the year 1834, (I believe,) instituting the trial by jury, and appointed a gentleman of legal acquirements, formerly a citizen of the United States, one of the judges to carry it into effect. A series of essays, written in the Spanish language, were also published in the newspaper at the seat of the State Government about that time, elucidating the nature and advantages of the trial by jury. Thus we perceive that measures *were* taken—probably as soon as the state of things would admit—to incorporate this institution in the code of laws. And, in the alterations proposed for the Constitution of the Republic, no mention has been made relative to this particular subject. The reader will, therefore, judge with what truth the assertion has been made, that the government "refused" to establish the trial by jury.

One of their grievances is declared to be, that the government "has failed to establish any public system of education." &c. Nations are not "born in a day"—neither can their institutions, when newly modelled, be matured instantaneously. "Public instruction" was considered a measure of paramount importance in defining the powers and duties of the government, and was enumerated with others in the constitutional provisions, but various causes prevented the adoption of a systematic plan of operations. The unsettled state of the country at particular times, and the lawless acts of the colonists themselves, were the principal causes that retarded the establishment of public schools and other

seminaries of learning, as the government proposed, and fully intended to have done.

They further charge the Federal Government with having acted tyrannically, as follows :

“It has suffered the military commandant stationed among us to exercise arbitrary acts of oppression and tyranny, thus trampling upon the most sacred rights of the citizens, and rendering the military superior to the civil power.”

In what respect these “arbitrary acts” have been exercised, is not specified. But, as I have before stated, they themselves refused to carry into effect the laws, or render obedience to the civil authority, in numerous instances; and, of course, the Executive was obliged to resort to the use of military force, to cause the due observance of legislative enactments.

Again, they say: “It has dissolved by force of arms the State Congress of Coahuila & Texas, and obliged our representatives to fly for their lives from the seat of government thus depriving us of the fundamental political right of representation.”

But they do not tell us that the State government had previously *nullified* the acts of the general Congress, in the sale of immense tracts of land, contrary to the provisions of the colonization laws. They keep out of view the fact, that it assumed the privilege of selling four hundred leagues, (1,771,200 English acres,) even to foreigners, in direct violation of the Federal statutes—and that one hundred leagues or more were actually thus disposed of to the New York land speculators. Even the “provisional government” of Texas, established on the return of Austin from the Mexican Capital, declared these proceedings of the state government illegal and void. Instead of being necessitated “to fly for their lives,” the members of the Legislature fled (it may rather be presumed) to avoid impeachment, or imprisonment and legal punishment for their misdeeds.

They also assert, that the government “has demanded the surrender of a number of [their] citizens, and ordered military detachments to secure and carry them into the interior for trial, in contempt of

the civil authority, and in defiance of the laws and the constitution.”

We do not learn, however, that measures of this nature had been adopted, until it had been sufficiently ascertained that the “civil authority” was prostrated, and the laws were wholly disregarded, in that section of the republic, so far as they chose to consider them inconsistent with their views and pretensions.

The following charge, too, is gravely preferred:—

“It has made piratical attacks upon our commerce, by commissioning foreign desperadoes, and authorizing them to seize our vessels, and convey the property of our citizens to far distant ports for confiscation.”

The Mexican government is yet in its infancy, and has a very small marine.—Of course, it has but few experienced naval commanders. Foreigners, in whom the government can repose confidence, are therefore occasionally appointed to the command of its armed vessels. I have before stated that the colonists were extensively engaged in contraband trade, the introduction of slaves, &c. The custom-house regulations were completely “nullified” by them, when the Mexican troops were expelled in 1832. I believe that not a single revenue establishment was kept up, except in those interior towns where the native population was numerous. When the government vessels did succeed in capturing those engaged in smuggling, &c., it was necessary to take them to ports guarded by troops, to prevent their being retaken by the smugglers and lawless “desperadoes” among the colonists themselves, in places where they could effect it with impunity. Possibly, some abuses may have existed under this regulation: but had the colonists consented to aid in the execution of the revenue laws in the Texas ports, such abuses (if there even were any) might have been obviated.

Another apparently serious “grievance” is stated thus:—

“It [the general government] denies us the right of worshipping the Almighty according to the dictates of our consciences—by the support of a national religion, calculated to promote the temporal interests of its human functionaries,

rather than the glory of the true and living God."

The institution of an established religion is a grand defect in the organization of the Mexican Republic. But this is nothing more than what may be said of the English, and many other European, as well as American governments. The colonists well knew that none but the established religion was ever tolerated, *constitutionally*, by the Mexican government, when they took the oath of allegiance to it. Many of them formally embraced the predominant faith, were baptized, renewed their marriage contracts, &c. according to the rites of the Catholic church. But a disposition very generally prevailed among the Mexican people, to tolerate the public exercise of all other professions of the Christian religion; and both Methodists and Presbyterians held their meetings, openly, in the colonies, without the least degree of molestation from the government or individuals. Even laws were enacted, by Mexicans, providing for their protection in the enjoyment of their religious privileges. Had they shown a disposition to unite with the native inhabitants in supporting the laws of the country, there can be no doubt that these privileges would eventually have been guaranteed them by permanent constitutional regulations.

I omit the notice of sundry items in the list of grievances, set forth by the framers of their "Declaration of Independence," as aforesaid. Many of them are merely incidental to the state of war, in which they have designedly involved themselves. But before I conclude my remarks, I must ask the attention of the reader to one more important specification, which they dwell on with particular emphasis, viz:—that "the whole nature of their government has been forcibly changed, without their consent," (meaning without the consent of the Mexican people at large); and that their "rulers" have established "a consolidated central military despotism, in which every interest is disregarded but that of the army and the priesthood," &c.

This sweeping, wholesale assumption is embodied in their preamble; but in the sequel, they admit that "*the Mexican people have acquiesced in*" what they

are pleased to call "the destruction of their liberty, and the substitution therefore of a military government." A few extracts from the Decree of the general Congress, relating to the proposed changes in the Constitution of the Republic, will throw some light upon this part of our subject, which is so completely involved in gloom by the "Declaration" of these revolutionists. The articles of the Decree, aforesaid, from the third to the ninth, read thus:—

3. The system of government of the nation is a republican, popular, representative one.

4. The exercise of the supreme national power will continue to be divided into Legislative, Executive and Judicial, which cannot be united in any case nor for any pretext.— There shall be established, moreover, means sufficient to prevent the three powers from transcending the limits of their attributes.

5. The exercise of the legislative power shall reside in a Congress of the representatives of the nation, divided into two Chambers, one of Deputies, and the other of Senators, who shall be elected periodically by the people. The constitutional law will determine the qualifications which the electors and the elected must possess; the time, manner, and form of their elections; the period of the elect; and every thing relative to the essential organization of these two parts of the aforementioned power, and to the circle of their prerogatives.

6. The exercise of the Executive power shall reside in a President, to be elected indirectly and periodically by the people, a Mexican by birth, whose other circumstances, as well as those of his election, his term of office, his powers and mode of exercising them, will be determined by the constitutional law.

7. The exercise of the Judicial power shall reside in a Supreme Court of Justice, and in the tribunals and judges, which the constitutional law shall establish: their prerogatives, their number, duration, radication, responsibility, and mode of election, the said law will establish.

8. The national territory will be divided into departments, upon the basis of population and other conducive circumstances: a constitutional law will detail their number, extent, and subdivisions.

9. For the government of the Departments, there shall be Governors and departmental juntas; these shall be chosen by the people, in the mode and in the number, which the law shall establish; and those shall be appointed periodically, by the supreme executive power, on the proposal of the said juntas.

These are the principle leading features of the Constitution proposed for the Mexican Republic, under its new organization. It would seem to bear very little resemblance to a mere system of "military despotism," as the Texas colonial insurrectionists assert!. The probability is, that the people will possess as much liberty, be equally as well protected in the enjoyment of their inherent, inalienable rights and privileges; and also witness more stability in their political institutions, and tranquillity among themselves, under such a form of government, than that of a more complicated system.

When it was proposed to organize a Federal Republican government in Mexico, after the brief reign of the *Emperor Iturbide*, delegates were elected by the people to meet in convention for the purpose. This body was denominated a "Constituent Congress," and was invested with authority to frame a Constitution, in much the same way as did the "Convention" which framed that of the United States of the North. But in providing for future amendments or alterations of the Constitution, which was subsequently adopted by the nation, the calling of such conventions was dispensed with; and the necessary power was delegated to the general Congress, to be exercised, should the state of the country require it, under certain formal rules of proceeding. One of the Articles of the Constitution, granting this authority to the National Congress, is in these words:—

"In order to reform or amend this Constitution or the Constitutive Act, shall be observed, besides the rules prescribed in the foregoing articles, all the requisites provided for the formation of laws, *excepting* the right to make observations granted to the President, in article 106."

The Congress was thus constituted a "Convention," for this especial purpose, entirely *independent of the Executive*. The "right to make observations granted to the President," in the formation of general laws, was the same in principle as that of the *Veto power*, given to the President of this Republic. In the case before us, it was withheld. It will there-

fore appear, that the Mexican Congress was duly authorized to "reform or amend" the national Constitution, when the state of the country should require it. Whether the actual state of things *did* call for it, or not, is a pertinent subject for investigation, before we join the revolutionists in their condemnation of the measure. That body acted upon its constitutional responsibility, and it may be presumed independently of all authority but that of the people, to whom alone the members were amenable for the abuse of their power.

I have previously stated that the principles of "Nullification," as professed by many in this country, had taken deep root, and were often practically exemplified, in the Mexican Confederacy. The Texas colonists, individually, and some of the States, in their "sovereign" capacity, acted them out thoroughly; and not only were the tranquillity and prosperity of the nation thus endangered, but even the stability of its free institutions, and the permanency of the government, were rendered wholly insecure, and liable to eventual destruction. The more intelligent and reflecting among the Mexican people, were fully sensible of this. They found, by an experience of years, that the complicated system of government, adopted by their Anglo-American neighbours, was not sufficiently understood by the mass of their citizens, and consequently not adapted to their state and condition. In considering the proposal for a change in the Constitution, the municipality of Toluca expressed the following views and sentiments:—

"Feeling, therefore, the pressing and imperious necessity of terminating and hereafter preventing the abuses which have frequently been made of power by the authorities of the different States—using it formerly and at present in several of them to the prejudice of the people, with whose happiness (the prime object of all social institutions) they had been entrusted, but which they sacrificed to their own private interests or to disgraceful passions: convinced, also, that it is indispensably necessary to adopt a mode of government more consistent with the establishment of an administra-

tion so economical as to repair the poverty, decay, and ruin, to which the profession and complexions of the present system has reduced the country, and so strong as to extricate it from opprobrious and oppressive bankruptcy; to supply our internal wants, and restore and consolidate our impaired credit; opposed also to tyrannical and absolute power, whether exercised by one or more persons, or by the unbiassed multitude; tired of enduring sometimes heavy and barbarous oppression, sometimes dreadful and bloody anarchy; desirous at length to see perpetually and irrevocably secured the peaceable enjoyment of a moderate national and constitutional freedom, and of the other social rights which have hitherto been merely nominal, and basely violated." &c. &c.

With this understanding of their state and condition, and this desire to improve it, in order to secure the peace and happiness of themselves and the successive generations of their posterity, the change in the constitution was proposed, and sanctioned voluntarily by an immense majority of the Mexican people. It was also finally "acquiesced in" by them *unanimously*, with the exception of a small fractional part of the inhabitants of one of the states—and that fractional part composed almost entirely of foreigners, many of whom had not acquired citizenship in the Republic. This is the *ostensible pretext*, (though not the real one,) now urged by the Texas insurrectionists, for waging war against the Mexican government. They did not pretend to have sufficient cause of complaint, to adopt measures for their entire independence, so long as the hope existed that the Federal form of government could be continued. It is evident, therefore, that *they* were not oppressed. But they deny to the great mass of the Mexican people the right to abrogate such institutions as their own experience teaches them are unsuited to their condition; unless, indeed, they will give up a large portion of their country, and leave a great number of their brethren to the exclusive control and unapproved government of foreigners. Texas never did exercise the authority of an independent sovereignty. Neither did the colonists ever, exclu-

sively, possess the attributes of a community, clothed with any political power whatever. When they settled in the country, they took up their abode among the native inhabitants, promised obedience to their laws, and were ever *legally* subject to all the regulations of their government. They never possessed a shadow of legal title to a foot of the soil, further than what a part of them acquired by the munificence and liberality of that same people and government, and what they obtained by purchase from them. What authority then can they claim, to dictate to the Mexican nation the formula of its political institutions—or demand the relinquishment of its right to possess and govern the country in which they have thus been permitted to settle themselves? It was an acknowledged axiom with the founders of this Republic, that whenever any form of government fails to secure to its citizens generally the possession of their inalienable privileges, in the "pursuit of happiness," &c.—"it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness." Yet they never promulged the doctrine, that a small minority in a community should exercise the right to prevent the *majority* from carrying this principle into effect. To elucidate the subject more fully, let us suppose a case, which would be strictly analagous to the one before us.

At the close of the American revolution, and previous to the organization of our present form of government, a part of the Province of Pennsylvania was settled by a considerable number of Germans. They had migrated from the monarchical principalities of Europe, or at least from countries whose political institutions were different in their principles and organic structure from ours. We will suppose they did not approve the democratic republican form of government which our fathers established under the present Constitution. They composed a small part of the population of the province. They were settled among the native inhabitants, (or there were a

large number of natives in the same part with themselves) whose ancestors had opened farms and built up villages long before these foreigners had asked or obtained permission to fix their residence there. They had declared allegiance to the government under the first confederation; they promised obedience to the laws and regulations which should in future be enacted by the legal authorities; and they were kindly treated, and in a few instances advanced to stations of honour, trust and profit. But although the native inhabitants in the province outnumbered them, as more than three or four to one, we will assume that they refused their sanction to the government, under the federal organization of this Union. The natives were almost unanimous in giving their assent; all, except these *foreigners*, approved or finally "acquiesced" in the proposed change.

Now, let us suppose, that in this state of things, these Germans had declared for the old confederation, taken up arms to resist the authority of the general Congress, called upon their brethren in Europe to aid them in their *rebellion*, and finally declared the independence of Lancaster, Berks, and as many other contiguous Counties as they might eventually be able to conquer: nay, suppose they had expressed the intention in their "Declaration," to make themselves masters of the whole State of Pennsylvania, a part of Virginia and of Ohio, and nearly all the Territory of Michigan, while they were still dependent upon the Germans in Europe for men, money, and other means to accomplish their object!! What, I ask, would the people of the United States have said and *done*? What would their brethren, "their own countrymen" in Europe, consider their duty in such a case? What judgment, indeed, would the nations of the civilized world have pronounced upon *their* daring "usurpation" of power—their ambitious, yet impotent efforts—their total disregard of justice, or their ignorance of the fundamental principles of human government? I need not say what the impartial verdict would have been.

Tell me not, that the comparison here fails in the application to our subject. It is strictly correct in every essential

particular. If there is any variance in the similitude, the Germans of Pennsylvania would have been more justifiable than the Texas colonists in raising the standard of revolt, had they objected to the change in the form of government upon the principle above stated. Many of the former settled in the country long before the native inhabitants threw off the shackles of foreign domination, and helped to fight the battles of national liberty. But the latter (with the exception of a very few) introduced themselves after the independence of the nation had been secured, by the establishment of a new government. Those who are acquainted with the history of Texas colonization, well know that I have fairly stated facts and circumstances; and it will be found, in the end, that my inferences are just and my conclusions undeniable.

I have stated that "a vast combination was entered into, (though not formally organized,)" having in view the re-establishment of slavery in the Texas country, &c. I might rest the assertion on the evidence already adduced in proof of this; but, in order to illustrate it more clearly, I will ask the reader's attention to some more facts and observations connected with the subject.

This design was openly manifested a short time after the settlement of the famous "Missouri Question," by which it was decided that slavery should never be extended to any portion of the territory of the United States, above the line of 36 degrees and 30 minutes of north latitude. When the treaty, defining the western boundary of Louisiana, was ratified by our government, many of our citizens were dissatisfied, because the Texas country was not included within its limits. To some of these the question of slavery, in that region, did not probably then occur; but soon after the colonization commenced, under Austin, it became a subject of general conversation and newspaper remark, in our Southern States. All the writers for the papers, at that period, contemplated the annexation of the territory to that of the United States. Among the first who publicly advocated the measure, particularly in reference to the extension of the system

of slavery, were the writers of two or more series of essays, originally published at St. Louis, in Missouri, over the signatures of "*Americanus*," and "*La Salle*."* These essays were attributed to the pen of the Hon. T. H. Benton, now a Senator in the Congress of the United States. To give the reader a correct idea of their drift, and the manner in which the doctrines they inculcated were received in different parts of the Union, I submit a few extracts from sundry publications, issued soon after they made their appearance. It may be proper, however, to premise, that our government (then completely under the influence of the slave-holding interest) was endeavouring to obtain a cession of the territory in question, and that it was at the period of the last invasion of Mexico, by the armies of Spain. The first quotation which I shall make; is from the *Edgefield Carolinian*, a newspaper said to be then under the control of the present Governor McDuffie, of South Carolina.

"The acquisition of Texas, relinquished by the government of the United States to the *magnanimous* Ferdinand VII. by the *Florida* treaty of 1819, is now a subject of much interest in the western states. This valuable territory has now devolved on the republic of Mexico, and from the condition of that country, *suffering under invasion and civil war, and with scanty finances*, it is supposed that the retrocession might be obtained for a reasonable equivalent. Great confidence is expressed that the administration will embrace the present favourable occasion

* By a reference to the Speech of John Quincy Adams, some extracts from which have heretofore been given, it will be perceived, that our government actually claimed the Texas country, and other parts of the territory adjoining, as far as the Rio Bravo del Norte, when Louisiana was ceded to the U. States; and it will also be found, by a reference to the same Speech, that this claim could not be sustained, by diplomatic effort, and was *formally abandoned*.

Mr. Adams so forcibly depicts the grasping designs of our slaveholding, land-speculating gentry, that his statements have attracted the attention of thousands in this country, and also in Mexico. His Speech has been translated into the Spanish language, and published in a pamphlet at the Mexican Capital—a copy of which we have received.

of regaining an extensive and fertile region of country *within the natural limits of the United States*. Some imposing essays originally published in the St. Louis Beacon, with the signature of 'Americanus,' and attributed to Col. Benton, of the Senate, explaining the circumstances of the treaty of 1819, and *displaying the advantages* of the retrocession, have operated upon the public mind in the west with electrical force and rapidity. The writer produces strong circumstantial proof that the surrender of Texas resulted from the subserviency of our negotiator to Spain, in her contest with Mexico, together with the powerful subsiding motive of hostility to the southern and western sections of our own country.

"This large fragment of the Mississippi valley, affording sufficient territory for *four or five slave-holding states*, was unceremoniously sacrificed with scarcely a pretext of a demand for it on the part of Spain. The time of the negotiation was during the heat of the debate on the Missouri question—the place was Washington, whither the negotiation had been unnecessarily removed, while it was proceeding prosperously at Madrid, and where the restrictionists were then assembled in all their strength, and the negotiator was Mr. Adams, the friend and associate of the most thorough-going among those restrictionists. 'Americanus,' exposes the evils to the United States of this surrender under twelve distinct heads. Two of them of particular interest to this section of the country, are that it *brings a non-slave-holding empire in juxtaposition with the slave-holding south west*, and diminishes the outlet for the Indians, inhabiting the States of Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee."

A Charleston paper also then observed: "It is not improbable that he [President Jackson] is now examining the propriety and practicability of a retrocession of the vast territory of Texas, an enterprise loudly demanded by the welfare of the west, and which could not fail to exercise an important and favourable influence upon the future destinies of the south, by increasing the votes of the slaveholding states in the United States senate."

The Louisiana papers entered warmly into the discussion of the question, about the same time. One of them openly asserted that GEN. HOUSTON had *then* gone to the Texas country, *for the purpose of revolutionizing it*, and observed: "We may expect, shortly, to hear of his raising his flag."

The *Arkansas Gazette*, a paper thoroughly identified with the slave-holding interest, held forth this language, in the year 1830, respecting the purchase of the Texas country:—

"As the subject of the purchase of Texas has engrossed much of the attention of our politicians for a year or two past, it may not perhaps be improper to state that we are in possession of information, derived from a source entitled to the highest credit, which destroys all hope of the speedy acquisition of that country by the United States. Col. Butler, the Chargé d'Affaires of the United States to Mexico, was specially authorized by the President to treat with that government for the purchase of Texas. The present predominant party are decidedly opposed to the ceding any portion of its territory. [The writer might have added, and so are *all parties*.] No hopes need therefore be entertained of our acquiring Texas, until some other party more friendly to the United States than the present, shall predominate in Mexico, and *perhaps* not until the people of Texas *shall throw off the yoke of allegiance* to that government, which they will do no doubt so soon as they shall have a reasonable *pretext* for doing so.* At present they are probably subject to as few exactions and impositions as any people under the sun."

*This idea prevailed so generally in Mississippi, at the period here alluded to, that the electors of one district put the following, among other interrogatories, to their candidates for Congress:—

"Your opinion of the acquisition of Texas, and how—whether by force or treaty—and whether the law preventing the emigration of the Americans is not evidence of apprehension that that province wishes to secede from the Mexican government—and whether, if requested, we ought to give the seceder military assistance—and what would be the effect of the acquisition of Texas upon our planting interest.

In addition to the writings of various editors of newspapers and their correspondents, we might enumerate the speeches of distinguished political orators, members of legislative bodies, &c. tending to show the general anxiety of the people in our southern states for the acquisition of Texas, and the certain calculations they made on the establishment and perpetuation of slavery therein. I will, however, quote a few from only one or two. In the Virginia Convention of 1829, Judge Usphur, of the Superior Court, observed, in a speech of considerable length, that if Texas should be obtained, which he strongly desired, it would raise the price of slaves, and be a great advantage to the slave holders in that state.—Mr. Gholson also stated in the Virginia assembly, in the year 1832, that the price of slaves fell *twenty-five per cent.* within two hours after the news were received of the non-importation Act which was passed by the Legislature of Louisiana. Yet he believed the acquisition of Texas would raise their price *fifty per cent.* at least.

These *plain indications* of the resolution formed by the slaveholding party in the United States, for the acquisition of the Texas country, opened the eyes of some of our honest citizens. A few of the northern presses spoke out upon the subject. The *Genius of Universal Emancipation*, for September 16th, 1829, then published in Baltimore, contained the following article.—

"IMPORTANT RUMOR.

We copy the information below, from the "National Journal." The public has been, for some months, acquainted with the fact that Capt. Austin has had the grant of certain privileges in navigating the *Rio del Norte* with steam vessels, &c. And it has also been *conjectured* that a disposition prevailed, among some of our politicians, to annex the vast tract of country, comprising the Texas and parts, or the whole, of several of the adjoining Mexican provinces, to this Republic. But we have not, until very recently, learned that a project of this kind is not only *on foot*, but that our minister to Mexico is using his influence

to induce that government to cede to us the country in question.

This proposition, we think, is of much greater importance than at first meets the eye. Some of our contemporaries speak quite favourably of the adoption of immediate measures for the acquisition of the territory in question. Others, in noticing it, pass over it without comment.

What, we would ask, would be the consequence of adding so large a territory to our already extensive domain? *What the line of policy that will, in such an event, be pursued with respect to SLAVERY, in said territory?* These momentous queries force themselves upon our minds, as subjects of the deepest interest. We shall very soon recur to the general subject, and give our views of it more at length.

Texas.—Of the importance of this vast territory, whether viewed geographically or politically, as an appendage to the United States, every one must be well aware. We believe that no man is more sensible of the value of such an acquisition than our minister to Mexico; and we believe that a treaty of boundary, by which the Texas should be included in our Republic, has been one of the chief objects of his hopes, and, as far as he could with propriety act, his efforts. The following article, extracted from the *Creole*, refers to a report that Great Britain has attempted to obtain by purchase this large tract of territory. In the present depressed and distracted condition of Mexico; a great portion of her capital lost by her impolitic exclusion of the old Spaniards; and an expedition hostile in its character and designs, on its way to her shores, it is not to be conceived that she will listen with indifference to any offers addressed to her cupidity. It may be a subject well worthy the attention and deliberations of Congress, whether an appropriation to the amount required for the acquisition of this territory, would not be amply compensated by so large an accession to our territorial wealth and political power:

TEXAS.—*Rio Grande del Norte, or Great North River.*—Captain Austin has obtained a grant from each of the States through which this river passes, securing to him the exclusive navigation of its waters, and is about to proceed on his first voyage, to ascend it by steam as high as Chihuahua, the capital of the State of that name, a distance of about six hundred miles. A voyage from New Orleans to Metamoros or Refugio, on the del Norte, can be made in three or four days, and thence by steam to Chihuahua in the same time. The *Ariel*, which left New

York, for this purpose, has an engine of 36 horse power, is about 100 tons burthen, moves at the rate of eleven miles and a half an hour, and draws but 3 feet 4 inches water. At high water she can get up to within 15 leagues of Santa Fe, without being obstructed by the rapids. Thus a journey which now occupies two months, may be performed in a fortnight, and the products of one of the richest and most delightful regions in the world be added to our imports.

A rumour reached us by the last packet from Mexico, (the *Virginia*) that a company of British merchants had offered to advance \$5,000,000 to the Mexican government, on the condition that the Province of Texas should be placed under the protection of Great Britain. It was also said that a proposition would be made by the Mexican government, to put the Texas lands into our possession, on a loan of the above sum.—This would be in contemplation of a treaty of cession to the United States, by which the Rio del Norte will become our southern boundary, if the proposition should still be accepted. The talents and experience of Captain Austin render him every way qualified to the bold project he has conceived, and we hope to see him early crowned with success proportioned to his zeal and activity.

Creole.

In the *Nashville Banner* of the 21st ult. we find some communications on this subject; in one of which it is recommended to exchange the territory west of the Rocky Mountains for the province of Texas. The acquisition of the Texas has been advocated by Mr. Clay, in his speech on the Spanish treaty, in which he also eloquently deprecates the attainment of the province by any foreign power. "If (said he) Texas, after being peopled by us, should at some distant day break off, she will carry with her a noble crew, consisting of our children's children, the sons of freemen."

From one of the communications of the *Banner* we make the following extract, in reference to this subject.

"The custom house of New Orleans has paid the purchase money of Louisiana. If there is any man in the Union who has felt himself straitened in his private affairs in consequence of this payment, let him proclaim his name, and he shall have redress— but there is not one.

"The customs of Texas would do the same thing. The Mexican, steeped to the lip in poverty, threatened with a powerful invasion by the mother country, will part with this property or any thing else for the sake of money. Now is the time, and this is the hour, to strike for our country's weal.

"Commercial men, every way qualified to

form an estimate and to give an opinion. have said that Texas, in the hands of the British, would be of as much, or more importance to them, than the island of Jamaica. Let us for a moment imagine this delightful region in the hands of that proud and overbearing nation, flinging bones of discord to the two sister republics, and then imagine, if you can, the deep toned imprecations, that would pervade this nation from *Maine* to the *Sabine*, from the sources of the *Missouri* to the mouth of the *Chesapeake*.

"I believe president Jackson has a listening attentive ear. It is said he would as soon scan the opinions of a corporal, as those of a Major General, and that he with equal readiness would adopt or reject either as his judgment might determine. Believing this to be the fact, I venture to make the above suggestion—with the addition that there is not one moment to be lost."

Since the foregoing was put in type, we have seen a number of spirited essays upon the subject before us; and we cannot longer disguise the fact, *that the advocates of slavery are resolved, at all hazards, to obtain the territory in question, if possible, FOR THE AVOWED PURPOSE OF ADDING FIVE OR SIX MORE SLAVE HOLDING STATES TO THIS UNION!!!*

It is now time for the people of the United States, who are opposed to the further extension of this horrible evil, (an evil unparalleled in the present state of the world,) to AROUSE FROM THEIR LETHARGY, and nip the monstrous attempt in the bud. We therefore call upon them, *with burning anxiety*, to open their eyes to a sense of the approaching danger. A "Missouri Question"—nay, a "Question," vastly more important, is *now* upon the tapis. Let it be duly considered; and let the public voice, *from every quarter of the Republic*, denounce in tones of thunder, the *unhallowed proceeding*.

It must be borne in mind, that the system of slavery *has been abolished in Texas*, by the Mexican government. It is now a FREE STATE. But the *avowed* design of Senator *Benton*, and others of his political clan, is to change this state of things, and introduce the slave system, with all its barbarities, again. Should the territory be added to this Union, *upon the condition that slavery should still be INTERDICTED*, a great number of the

colored people in the United States, at least those bordering on the Mississippi, might be induced to remove thither. *It would be the most suitable place for them in the world.* But a GREATER CURSE could scarcely befall our country, than the annexation of that immense territory to this Republic, if the system of slavery should likewise be re-established there.

The present Administration of the general government is believed to be in favor of obtaining this territory, *with the view of increasing the number of Slave holding states.* It is, indeed, boldly intimated in the *National Intelligencer*, that NEGOTIATIONS FOR IT ARE NOW PENDING. Again we say: Let the public sentiment be expressed.—Let the moral influence of the people—(the honest yeomanry of the nation)—be heard, from the highest peak of our mountains to the lowest valley—from the northern and eastern confines of the Union to its farthest southern and western limits. A more important occasion for such an expression of their will never occurred, and perhaps never may again. We shall not let the matter rest here."

The *Genius of Universal Emancipation*, for September 25th, (the week following,) pursues the subject as follows:

"THE PURCHASE OF TEXAS.

This subject now resolves itself into a *National Question* of the utmost importance—the LIMITATION AND CIRCUMSCRIPTION, or the EXTENSION and PERPETUATION, of AMERICAN SLAVERY. It will be in vain for any one to place a different construction upon the proposition. The quarter in which it originates; the champions who step forth in its defence; the time selected for its accomplishment;—but above all, the *argument used* to shew its propriety, prove as clearly as even the most indubitable evidence can prove, that the great and leading object of its advocates is to enlarge the boundaries of the region of Slavery, and extend the period of its duration, in this Republic.

It is well understood, in the political circles, that the most active promoter of this scheme is no less a personage than the famous THOMAS H. BENTON, now a Senator in the Congress of the United States, and to whom the State of *Missouri*

is more indebted than to any other man, for the "blessings" of slavery, which have been entailed upon her. Benton is a man possessed of some good qualities. While his political principles, so far as they relate to slavery, are of the most detestable cast, *hypocrisy* is not, by any means, a conspicuous trait in his character. In general, he speaks out, boldly, the tyrannical aristocracy of his heart; and an opponent may always know where to find him. We knew him well, as a chivalrous quill-driver, during the period of the Missouri contest. Then, as now, he strenuously advocated the unlimited exercise of all the odious "privileges and immunities" of a hereditary, irresponsible slaveholder:—and, indeed, he *practically* understood the nature of the cause he espoused.

The essays now publishing in the newspapers, over the signature of "*Americanus*," urging the immediate purchase of the province of Texas, are said to be from the pen of this ambitious, political aspirant. Of the correctness of the supposition we have not a shadow of doubt. Now, as formerly, he unblushingly advocates the whole system of slavery, without any qualification whatever. One of the reasons that he assigns (and one which he seems to consider the strongest) for the purchase of Texas, is, as we have before stated, that "*five or six more slaveholding states*" *may thus be added to the Union*.—Indeed, he goes farther than this in one of his calculations, and estimates that "*NINE MORE STATES, as large as Kentucky*," may be formed within the limits of that province. He undertakes also, by much more than dubious insinuation, to shew that this would *give the slaveholding states a preponderating influence in the councils of the nation*. He likewise asserts, that the United States once had a rightful claim to the province of Texas, by virtue of the Louisiana purchase; but that (he continues) it was lost *through the influence of the non-slaveholding interest in Congress*. This being his view of the matter, he now calculates that the SLAVE-HOLDING PARTY is strong enough to reverse the existing state of things, and *open a new world*, as it were, for the employment of slave-labor, like the colonial

projectors have generally done before him, since the discovery of the American continent by the Europeans. There is a little difference, however, in the mode heretofore adopted for supplying the demand for slaves and that which he now has in contemplation. Instead of a dependence upon the African slave trade, he would convert the whole extent of country, where slave labor is unprofitable, and where provisions are cheap, into *an immense nursery for slaves*, and by this means people those more southern regions with a race of serviles (part of whom would be bred especially for the purpose) *at least twice as fast as it could be done by the foreign importation alone*. This would, indeed, be a splendid project! worthy of the capacious mind of a BENTON, who, we must admit, is fully competent to school a Hawkins, or a D'Wolf, in matters of this nature. The boldness with which he advocates measures so repugnant to the feelings of the more religious and moral portion of the community, would seem to savour somewhat of rashness. No other statesman, perhaps, would dare, at this period of republican reformation, and in this era of republican light, to utter the tyrannical sentiments that he does, on slavery, at least in so open and undisguised a manner. He must have great confidence in the strength of the *slaveite party*; or, otherwise, he must calculate largely upon the aid of the "*dough-faced*" gentry of the non-slaveholding states. To secure the co-operation of these, every appeal will be made to their cupidity—every inducement held out that the hope of governmental patronage, under the present dynasty, can conjure up.—And that some of them will prove recreant in the hour of trial, and lash themselves to the car of despotism, past experience leaves us no room to doubt. How many will thus degrade themselves, and disgrace the land of their birth, time alone will show.

We are glad to find, since the last number of our paper was issued, that the subject before us is viewed in the same light as we view it, by some of our most respectable contemporaries. The *Pennsylvania Gazette*, of Philadelphia, and the *American*, of New York, have come

out in plain terms, and express in a decided tone their apprehensions, as follows:—

From the Pennsylvania Gazette.

The acquisition of the Texas promises to be a leading measure of the present administration, and without doubt, one of great magnitude and importance. This will be very apparent from the fact as stated, that the territory in question will make nine states, as large as Kentucky; to which add the appalling consideration, that it is designed to make these nine states *slave states*. We are told also, that “the proper steps have been taken to procure the cession.” It is high time, for the northern interest, the non-slaveholding states, to look around, to see how the balance of power, which it was the object of the federal constitution to create and preserve, will be affected by this bold undertaking. We are much pleased by the following remarks of the New York American.

“The Richmond Enquirer, with one of its hints that are meant to signify a great deal, says—“The Statesmen who are at the head of our affairs, are not the men we take them to be, if they have not already pursued the proper steps for obtaining the cession of Texas, even before the able Nos. of Americanus saw the light. But, *nous verrons!*” We are therefore to understand, that measures are already in train for the recovery of Texas. “*The able numbers of Americanus*” put the importance of this recovery to Southern men and Southern interest, on the ground of the space and advantages that country will afford, for, “the future existence of Slave States.” Within the boundaries of Texas, “nine States,” says Americanus, “as large as Kentucky may be formed.” With the immense benefits before our eyes secured to the United States by the acquisition of Louisiana, we should be cautious in pronouncing against the expediency of endeavouring to obtain, for a fair equivalent, so fine a province as Texas, and which runs in, in various parts, upon what may, perhaps, be not improperly called our national boundaries. Yet, on the other hand, when the great, and, as we do not hesitate to say, unjust preponderance of the Slave States, in the existing confederacy, is considered, it may well cause the inhabitants of the free states to pause, and maturely to consider the effect upon our institutions and Union, of the increase, by the half dozen, of these states—bound together by one common bond of peril, of profit, and of political power. The moral considerations, too, which belong to this subject, connected with the new and vast market that this province would open to the domestic slave trade—not less atrocious in principle, if somewhat milder in practice,

than that which on the coast of Africa, is pronounced piracy, and punished with death—will not fail to present themselves with force to the minds of all considerate men.”

The stand thus taken by the respectable and influential papers above named, inspires the hope that the more reflecting part of our fellow citizens will thwart the intentions of the advocates of slavery, in the present case, and put this gigantic scheme to rest for a season. We were aware that a deadly apathy existed, relative to the subject under review, and felt it our duty to sound the tocsin of alarm. Whatever we may think of the purchase of the territory in question, with the view of colonizing our colored people there *by themselves*, we do not think it would be safe to do it at the present period. True, the majority of the people are opposed to the extension of slavery; but will that majority act efficiently at the present time? We have strong doubts of this; and are decidedly of the opinion that the wisest policy will be to defer the purchase, until the public mind is fully prepared to restrict the extension of slavery beyond the limits of its present existence.”

The evidence thus exhibited of a disposition in the people and government of this country to obtain the territory in question, even contrary to the expressed wishes of the Mexicans, induced their statesmen to take a very serious view of the subject. The following is an extract from a paper laid before the Mexican Congress, in the year 1829, by the Secretary of State. A strong appeal was made to the nation, to sustain the government in resisting what was alleged to be a premeditated and determined encroachment upon their territorial sovereignty. I shall copy, however, but a small portion of his remarks.

“The North Americans commence by introducing themselves into the territory which they covet on pretence of commercial negotiations or of the establishment of colonies, with or without the assent of the Government to which it belongs. These colonies grow, multiply, become the predominant part in the population; and as soon as a support is found in this manner, they begin to set up rights which it is impossible to sus-

tain in a serious discussion, and to bring forward ridiculous pretensions, founded upon historical facts which are admitted by nobody, such as Lasalle's Voyages, now known to be a falsehood, but which serves as a support, at this time, for their claim to Texas. These extravagant opinions are, for the first time, presented to the world by unknown writers; and the labour which is employed by others in offering proofs and reasonings, is spent by them in repetitions and multiplied allegations, for the purpose of drawing the attention of their fellow citizens, not upon the justice of the proposition, but upon the advantages and interests to be obtained or subverted by their admission.

"Their machinations in the country they wish to acquire, are then brought to light by the appearance of explorers, some of whom settle on the soil, alleging that their presence does not affect the question of the right of sovereignty or possession of the land. These pioneers excite, by degrees, movements which disturb the political state of the country in dispute; and then follow discontents and dissatisfaction calculated to fatigue the patience of the legitimate owner, and to diminish the usefulness of the administration and of the exercise of authority. When things have come to this pass, which is precisely the present state of things in Texas, the diplomatic management commences. The inquietude they have excited in the territory in dispute, the interests of the colonists therein established, the insurrection of adventurers and savages instigated by them, and the pertinacity with which the opinion is set up as to their right of possession, become the subjects of notes full of expressions of justice and moderation, until, with the aid of other incidents which are never wanting in the course of diplomatic relations, the desired end is attained of concluding an arrangement, onerous for one party as it is advantageous to the other.

"It has been said further, that when the United States of the North have succeeded in giving the predominance to the colonists introduced into the countries they had in view, they set up rights, and bring forward pretensions founded

upon disputed historical facts, availing themselves generally, for the purpose, of some critical conjuncture to which they suppose that the attention of Government must be directed. This policy, which has produced good results to them, they have commenced carrying into effect with Texas. The public prints in those states, including those which are more immediately under the influence of their government, are engaged in discussing the right they imagine they have to the country as far as the Rio Bravo. Handbills are printed on the same subject, and thrown into general circulation, whose object is to persuade and convince the people of the utility and expediency of the meditated project. Some of them have said that Providence had marked out the Rio Bravo as the natural boundary of those states, which has induced an English writer to reproach them with an attempt to make Providence the author of their usurpations: but what is most remarkable, is, that they have commenced that discussion precisely at the same time they saw us engaged in repelling the Spanish invasion, believing that our attention would, for a long time, be thereby withdrawn from other things.*"

Whether, the charges here made were correct, or not, I leave to the decision of the intelligent reader and the impartial historian. Such, however were the impressions that were made upon the minds of well informed Mexicans, and such the manner in which they expressed their sentiments. Some of the writers for their public presses were very pointed and severe. One of them, in speaking of the efforts of our diplomatic agent, to alienate the territory from the Mexican Republic, speaks thus:—"That when he found his offer objectionable, he further insulted the nation by proposing a loan of ten millions, as a pawn-broker would, upon the pawning of Texas until repaid, which insidious proposal was meant to fill the country of Texas with Anglo-Americans and slaves, and to hold it afterwards in any event: that citizens of the United

*See the extract from the "Nashville Banner," in a preceding column, I believe that the article was written precisely at this juncture—and the writer concludes by saying, "there is not one moment to be lost."

States encourage the excursions of the Comanches, and other predatory tribes, against the Mexican frontier settlements, furnishing them with arms, and buying their stolen mules, and even Mexican free-men, such as mulattoes, and Indians, to be held as slaves in Louisiana, &c.: that they have suggested to the Texas colonists at various times to rebel, and declare the country independent of Mexico, or even ask an union with the United States of the North, who will allow the base of slavery."

The excitement produced among the Mexicans, by the efforts above alluded to, was very great; and upon the strength of these impressions, the general Congress passed the law of April 6th, 1830, prohibiting the further migration of Anglo-Americans into Texas. The jealousy of the British government was also aroused, and the subject was noticed in the lower House of Parliament. A debate occurred in which the celebrated *Mr. Huskisson* took a leading part, that manifested the liveliest interest in the independence of the Mexican Republic, and the integrity of its territory. It would require too much space at present to insert the speeches, made during this discussion; but a brief synopsis, or hasty review of it, is here given from the London "*Times*":—

"*Mr. Huskisson*, in presenting the Liverpool petition on the subject of their relations with Spain and Mexico, in the course of last night, urged with great force the propriety of preventing Spain from making further attacks from the side of Cuba, on the now liberated Republic of Mexico.

"There was a further subject, and one of extreme importance, discussed by *Mr. Huskisson*, in the course of his speech—we mean the general prevalence of an opinion that the United States covet a fine province of Mexico, called Texas, and are disposed to have recourse to violence, if necessary, for the purpose of getting it into their hands. The province of Texas extends southwards from the United States along the coast of Mexico, and as such, the seizure of it by the former power could not be a matter of perfect indifference to Great Britain. The possession of the Floridas by the United

States, has long since given rational cause of uneasiness to England, from regard to the safety of our West India Islands; and we agree with *Mr. Huskisson*, that when the government of Washington intimated its repugnance to seeing Cuba transferred from the feeble Ferdinand to the vigorous grasp of George IV., the United States should have been informed that if Cuba were to continue permanently Spanish, so Texas, and in general the whole shore along the Gulf, should ensure to the Mexican republic.

"The reference made by the Right Hon. Gentleman to communications, official as well as private, from the late *Mr. Jefferson*, descriptive of the eager and deep rooted longings of the American statesmen for slices of Mexico, and above all things for the island of Cuba, will not, we are sure, be lost upon the memory of his Majesty's Government in its future transactions with the Spanish Cabinet, with that of Mexico, and of the United States. With Spain we have a defensive alliance, ready made and consolidated by the most obvious interest, to prevent Cuba from falling a prey to the systematic aggrandizement of the United States. With Mexico, we are equally identified in resistance to the attempts of the same States upon Texas."

It must be observed that the principal advocates of measures for the acquisition of Texas, in the United States, previous to this period, were the southern slaveholders;—and their influence was now paramount in the Cabinet. But finding that the territory could not be obtained by negotiation and purchase, and well knowing that no legal claim to it could possibly be sustained, the government declined pressing the matter further at the time. The writers for the newspaper press, too, now ceased to urge it upon the public attention. Yet the scheme was by no means abandoned. A different mode of operations was planned and adopted, for the ultimate and certain accomplishment of their object. It was known that nearly all the colonists in Texas were originally from our slave holding States, and either slave holders themselves, or friendly to the re-establishment and perpetuation of the system of slavery

there. The plan thenceforth pursued was, to misrepresent the Mexican laws & colonial regulations, relative to slavery, and induce the emigration of persons favourable to their views, until their numerical and physical strength should enable them to take advantage of some critical conjuncture, and subject the country, at least, to their legislative control. Should they succeed in this, they believed that they would, finally, be able to carry their whole design into effect—which could be done either by the future attachment of the territory to the northern Union, or to a new confederacy that might eventually be organized, still more favourable to the principle and practice of slaveholding. As I have stated before, in my previous remarks, the private correspondence kept up for this purpose was very extensive, and the emigration from our southern States to the Texas country continued to increase. Slaves were taken in without hesitation, and men of wealth, enterprise, and influence throughout the southern and southwestern States, lent their countenance and aid to the scheme.

Since the present insurrection commenced, the excitement against our citizens in Mexico has risen, of course, to a higher pitch than ever. The late Speech, delivered by John Quincy Adams, in the Congress of the United States, and translated into the Spanish language, as aforesaid was published in that country, with the following introductory remarks:—

“The discourse annexed, which was delivered in the House of Representatives of the United States, by the Ex-President, John Quincy Adams, is a Document which, in the actual state of things, ought to attract the attention of all reflecting men; not absolutely as a specimen of oratory, but as that of the effusions of a sublimated soul, which soars above the corruption of the times, dares to promulgate the truth in its purity, and plead in defence of the principles of Justice, so scandalously trampled upon in his country with respect to the question relating to Texas.

The speculators in Land, at New Orleans and New York, have conceived the project of enriching themselves, by wres-

ting from Mexico the territory of Texas; and as it became requisite to give an air of honesty to their base intentions, they have, with a plausible pretext, fastened upon the much abused epithet of *Liberty*.—But there is another design, which threatens the Political existence of the *Hispano-American Nations*,—especially of Central America, and New Granada, which by their geographical position, and peculiar advantages in the commercial sphere, may be considered as the *Keys* of the Continent: this design is the establishment of SLAVERY. So that, if the Anglo-Americans succeed in their effort of appropriating Texas to themselves, Mexicans, Central-Americans, Granadians, tremble for your future destiny! because, on a day least thought of, you will become the prey of the insatiable Anglo-Saxon-American cupidity; and the soil on which you now tread, will be sold by lots at each Public Exchange of the United States, to fill the purses of your Invaders, and to transfer your plantations and other territorial possessions to the hands of the trafficking mob, who look forward for the moment to subjugate you.

The discourse of Mr. Adams reveals important mysteries—it discovers plans, which he magnanimously condemns, and publishes that which, afar off, all cannot see. Mr. Adams, an Anglo-American, well knows the character of his countrymen; and guided by a pure zeal for the cause of humanity, and of justice, he has not dreaded to draw upon himself the hatred of his depraved cotemporaries, and at least to preserve his personal honor, since he cannot that of his country, before the tribunal of mankind and of posterity, by affording in this manner to Philanthropists, to the truly liberal, and to all worthy men, the satisfaction of seeing him defend, with courage and energy, the noble cause of the freedom of the human race.

But above all, the Mexicans ought to know the high destinies to which Providence calls them in the New World, by confiding to their care nothing less than the guardianship of this same Liberty. What imports it, that hireling Editors and Land-jobbers vociferate? if the whole world is to be the witness, and

judge of the rectitude of this noble cause? What imports it, that general Santa Anna has had a disastrous encounter, if his personal fate (however to be lamented) be not that which led him on to battle: Is he the only Mexican who loves his country? is he the sole champion of liberty, whom Mexico can call forth to drive from the soil of the country the Banditti who propose to domineer over a part of it, in order forthwith to contaminate it by introducing hordes of Negro Slaves? This warfare admits of no compromise; it must terminate either in the beneficent triumph of the universal emancipation of the human race, or else the sacrifice of all liberty throughout America, by establishing slavery where it has been abolished, or has not existed, through the instrumentality of the degenerate portion of the English race, which now inhabit that part of the United States extending from the Capital to the boundaries of Texas.*

From the commencement of their operations, we have seen, that the "choice spirits" of that extensive, unholy combination of slaveholders and land-jobbers who have swayed the destinies of Texas, have steadily and undeviatingly pursued their object. They have constantly adhered to their settled, original purpose, however they may have occasionally relaxed their *open, undisguised* efforts. It is true, their rashness sometimes led them into the adoption of premature measures, and they were compelled to halt, and even to retrace their steps, for the moment. Those who had neither character nor property at stake, and those at a distance from the scene of action, were more reckless of consequences than the substantial settlers in the country, on whom the weight of responsibility must necessarily fall. This was strikingly exemplified in the case of Austin's treasonable attempt, which resulted in his imprisonment by order of the general government. Calculating on the intestine difficulties of the Republic, he was prompted to the commission of overt acts before their plans were sufficiently matured. The following letter (to which I have before alluded) will throw some additional light upon this part of our subject. It will be seen that he was

pushed forward against his own will and better judgement, while he candidly admits that the colonists had no cause of complaint against the government. Some precious confessions, indeed, are here recorded, which cannot fail to make the most forcible impressions on the mind of the reader.

The following letter from Col. Stephen F. Austin, was written immediately after his arrest by the Mexican Government, and is published in our latest Texas papers. We re-publish it as interesting to those who are seeking information of that fertile and promising region, its government and politics.

N. O. Bulletin.

MONTERREY, Jan. 17, 1834.

To the Ayuntamiento of San Felipe de Austin :

I have been arrested by an order from the minister of war, and leave soon for Mexico to answer to a charge made against me, as I understand, for writing an officio to the Ayuntamiento of Texas, dated 21st October last, advising, or rather recommending that they should consult amongst themselves for the purpose of organizing a local government for Texas, in the event that no remedies could be obtained for the evils that threatened that country with ruin.

I do not in any manner blame the Government for arresting me, and I particularly request that there may be no excitement about it.

I give the advice to the people there, that I have always given, keep quiet, discountenance all revolutionary measures or men, obey the State authorities and laws so long as you are attached to Coahuila, have no more conventions, *petition through the legal channels*, that is through the Ayuntamiento and chief of department, harmonize fully with the people of Bexar and Goliad, and act with them.

The general government are disposed to do every thing for Texas that can be done to promote its prosperity and welfare that is consistent with the constitution and laws, and I have no doubt the state government will do the same if they are applied to in a proper manner.

It will be remembered that I went to Mexico as a public agent with specific instructions, and as such, that it was my duty to be governed by them, and by the general wish of the people as expressed to me.* Also, that

* This "general wish" was not expressed by the great mass of the actual settlers in the colonies. No measures were adopted to ascertain the "general" wishes of the people. The sentiments thus expressed, were the clamors of the land-speculators and aspirants to power and office, and the urgent demands

when I left in April, the general wish did express itself for the separation from Coahuila and the forming of Texas into a State of this confederation. Also, that there was a determination to organize a local government at all hazards, if no remedy could be obtained.

I have in all my acts conformed to this public wish of the people, so far as I was informed of it; and when I despaired of obtaining any remedy, as I did in the beginning of October, I deemed it to be my duty as an agent, to inform the people so; and believing as I did, that they would organize, I also considered that it would be much better to do so, by a harmonious consultation of the Ayuntamientos, than by a popular commotion. There were many reasons for the recommendation given in that office; also, the result of the civil war was thought to be doubtful.

I understand and I rejoice to hear it, that public opinion has settled down on a *more reasonable basis*, and that the most of the Ayuntamientos of Texas have expressed their wish to proceed in a *legal manner* to seek redress. I ought to have been informed of this change, but I was not, and knew nothing of it to a certainty, until the 5th of November, so that up to that time I acted under the impressions I had when I left Texas in April. Since then I have not moved the state question.

The past events in Texas necessarily grew out of the revolution of Jalapa, which overturned the constitution and produced the counter revolution of Vera Cruz, which extended over the whole country, and involved Texas with the rest. It is well known that it was my wish to keep Texas, and particularly the colony, out of all revolution, and I tried to do so, but the flame broke out in my absence from Texas, in June 1832, and since then all has been completely disjointed. A current was set in motion by the general extents of the civil war all over the nation, and under the circumstances, Texas could not avoid being agitated by it. No one can be blamed in any manner for what has happened since June 1832, in Texas—it was inevitable—neither was it possible for me to avoid being drawn into the whirlpool. It was my duty to serve the country as an agent if requested to do so; and as an agent it was my duty to obey my instructions as expressed to me.

I have long since informed the Ayuntamiento of Texas, of the repeal of the law of April, and of the *favorable and friendly disposition of the government*, and by this, I of

course rescinded, or annulled the recommendation of 2d October, for that was predicated on the belief that nothing would be done, and that the result of the civil war then pending was doubtful; since then all has changed for the better, and public opinion in Texas has become sound,* and shaken of the excitement that necessarily grew out of the past agitations.

Under these circumstances the prospects of Texas are better than they ever have been. The national revolution is ended, a constitutional government exists, the people are obedient to the government and laws every where. Be the same in Texas, and have no more excitements, *tolerate no more violent measures, and you will prosper and obtain from the government, all that reasonable men ought to ask for.*

The last year has been one of calamities for Texas—floods, pestilence, and commotions; I hope the present year will be more favorable. I request that you will have this letter published for general information, and also the enclosed copy of the answer given to me by his Excellency the minister of relations. You will see by this answer the very favorable and friendly disposition of the general government to make a state or a territory of Texas, and do every thing else within its constitutional powers for the good of that country.

I consider my agency for Texas as terminated, but this will not prevent me from doing all I can for the good of that country, on my own individual responsibility.

Respectfully your most ob't serv't.

STEPHEN F. AUSTIN.

On the 10th of May, 1834, he also wrote as follows, from the place of his confinement at the seat of government. He does not admit that he had entertained the design of transferring the country to the government of the United States. No one will suspect that *he* had indulged a wish of that kind. It was his desire to be *at the head of political affairs* in Texas; and were it attached to the U. S. he would soon witness a *rivalry* that must eventually blast his hopes. But many others concerned in Texas politics, *did* contemplate the transfer in question;

† “Public opinion in Texas has become sound!”—The *actual settlers* had then more generally expressed their “wishes;” and the rebellious slaveites and marauders had found that they had pushed ahead *too soon*.—The writer himself was in a delicate and *difficult* situation, and a little prudent *policy* must be used to extricate him. His conduct eventually proved *how sincere* were his own professions of attachment to Mexico.

of lordly slaveholders, both resident and transient, among them. The more sober and orderly *inhabitants* were very generally *opposed* to it.

and, even according to Austin's confessions, the better disposed part of the *inhabitants*, himself included, were dictated to, and *ruled*, by the land-speculating and slave-traffic banditti, who had more convenient opportunities to concentrate their efforts. The letter from which the following is extracted, was directed to a gentleman in New Orleans.—

"I have been in close and solitary confinement here until yesterday, since the 13th February. Yesterday I was allowed to communicate with persons outside, receive books, writing materials, visits, &c. I expect to be at liberty in a short time, and shall probably return by way of Orleans. My confinement has been very rigid, but I have received no personal ill treatment. The good people of the Colony precipitated me into these difficulties, by their excitements. I came here as the agent of excited and fevered constituents, and I represented them regardless of my personal safety or welfare. I was much more impatient and of course imprudent than cold calculating prudence would sanction, but not more so than the tone and temper of my constituents required when I left them. I do not blame the Vice President or Government for arresting me—an attempt has been made to charge me with designs to separate Texas from Mexico and deliver it to the U. States of the North—that is totally false and without the shadow of foundation, as all are now convinced; so that I have no doubt I shall soon leave this place."

In order to make the reader more familiar with the proceedings of those concerned in this splendid project, in various parts of America, I will now present a succinct, though comprehensive view of their combined operations. Many individuals in other countries have a hand in it;—yet its *active promoters* are principally citizens of the United States.

The Republic of Mexico, from the period of its organization, evinced the utmost liberality towards foreigners in granting permission to colonize its vacant lands, until that liberality, and the confidence reposed in their friendly disposition, were grossly abused, particularly by those who proceeded from our own country. Of the immense tracts of land designated for colonization, in the various contracts entered into with the different "Empresarios," those granted to Zavala, Vehlein, and Burnet, were united and transferred to a company in New York, called the "Galvezton Bay

and Texas Land Company." This Association was fully organized on the 16th of October, 1830. The following named persons were appointed as Directors, viz: Lynde Catlin, Wm. G. Bucknor, George Griswold, Barney Corse, John Hagerty, Dudley Seldon, and Stephen Whitney. The following were also chosen as trustees, viz: Anthony Dey, George Curtis, Wm. H. Sumner. It is believed, however, that some of these subsequently declined acting, and others were appointed in their places.—The contract entered into by the Government with Zavala, was concluded on the 12th of March, 1829; with Vehlein, 21st December, 1826, and a second on the 11th October, 1828; with Burnet, 22d December, 1826. The grants to Dominguez, and Wilson & Exter, were in like manner conveyed to Elisha Tibbets, John S. Crary, Henry Hone and their associates, under the title of the "*Arkansas and Texas Land Company*," by whom Thomas Ludlow Ogden, Daniel Jackson, and Edward Curtis, were appointed Trustees to hold the same, &c.—Another company was organized at Nashville, Tennessee, and the grants made to Ross and Leftwitch were transferred to it, upon the same principle. A third company was likewise formed in New York, at a subsequent date, entitled the "*Rio Grand Company*," (I believe,) which agreed to colonize the tracts obtained by Grant & Beales, and Soto & Egerton, as well as others. These several companies created "stocks" upon the basis of those "grants" and threw them into the market. They also issued "scrip," authorizing the holders of it to take possession of certain tracts of land, within the lines marked out on the map as the boundaries of their respective grants. This "scrip" embraced tracts of various dimensions, and was sold to any who could be induced to purchase, at such prices as could be obtained. To a bona fide settler, (and none else could obtain the land it pretended to convey,) it could be of no advantage whatever, as the facilities and expense of procuring his tract, according to law, would be the same, whether he held the scrip or not. Every cent paid for it, therefore, was so much loss to the settler, and gain to the company. Al-

though these companies could only hold their grants through the medium of the *Empresarios*, for the limited period of six years, and on the express condition of settling a specified number of families, they dealt largely in their "stock," and sold immense quantities of "scrip," inasmuch that an immense amount of money has no doubt been realized by them—while very few settlers (in many of the grants *none*) have been introduced. By obtaining from the government an extension of the time stipulated for the fulfilment of contracts made with the *Empresarios*, they have been enabled to continue and increase their operations upon a grand scale. Thousands in various parts of the United States have purchased the scrip issued by them, and are interested, of course, in the adoption of measures to legalize their claims. This can never be done, however, while the laws are in force, under which the colonization privileges were obtained. When these companies were first organized, some honourable men engaged in their speculations, that were, doubtless, actuated by honest motives: but many have since joined in the scheme, who are reckless of all principle except that of money-making. The "scrip" being transferable, a large portion of it has fallen into the hands of needy adventurers, who likewise are willing to encourage any measures that may seem calculated to promote their immediate pecuniary interests.

To show more clearly how utterly at variance were these measures with the regulations adopted by the government for the settlement of the country, I here copy the Law enacted by the State Legislature, prescribing the terms upon which foreigners were permitted to colonize the vacant lands in Texas.—I believe this law has never before been published, at length, in the United States—at least I have not hitherto seen a *translation* of it in print. A reference to it will be useful, as well to elucidate the liberal views and propositions of the government, as to exhibit the dishonest practices of slaveholders and land-jobbers, who have parcelled out the territory among themselves and their associate adventurers. Although the law, here

quoted, is not the first that was enacted to encourage the colonization of the Texas country, it is nearly the same as the one originally promulgated—being merely a revision of the statute, with a few trifling alterations in details, without changing its general features or principles.

COLONIZATION LAW OF COAHUILA & TEXAS.

Supreme Government of the State of Coahuila & Texas.

The Governor of the State of Coahuila & Texas to all the inhabitants—health. The Congress of the said State has passed the following Decree.

[DECREE No. 190.]

The Constitutional Congress of the free, independent, and sovereign State of Coahuila & Texas, decrees as follows:

ARTICLE 1.—Those Mexicans who, at the period of the publication of this law, shall determine to settle any of the vacant land belonging to the State, are hereby offered asylum and protection.

ART. 2.—Any Mexican, or Mexicans, who shall propose to introduce, at his or their own expense, Ninety Families, at least, shall present themselves to the Government, and enter into contract, in conformity with this law; and the territory, in which they are to establish themselves, shall be pointed out—which contract shall be fulfilled within four years. Those who do not establish the said number of families, shall forfeit the rights and privileges hereby granted.

ART. 3.—So soon as Thirty Families shall be collected, they shall proceed to the formal establishment of new Towns, in the most convenient places in the opinion of the Government, or of the person commissioned by it, for that purpose; and for each new Town, four square Leagues of land shall be designated, the figure of which may be regular, or irregular, according to its location.

ART. 4.—If any site where a new Town shall be formed belong to an individual, and the establishment may be of known and general utility, it shall still be formed—observing the regulations of the Constitution, in the fourth restriction of Article 113.

ART. 5.—The Government, in consideration of the agreement which any contractor, or contractors, shall enter into, and for the better location and formation of the new towns, and the exact division of soil and water, shall commission a confidential person, who shall be of Mexican origin, and not enjoy foreign privileges, who shall proceed according to the instructions of the 4th of September, 1827, when not in opposition to this law.

ART. 6.—In Towns which admit of water

works, they will be constructed for account of those concerned. The Commissioner will divide the water off in pipes, or conduits, endeavoring to make them, at least, half a yard wide; one of which shall be for the use of the Town, and the others for irrigating the fields.

ART. 7.—The contractor and new settlers, in the division and location of land and water, shall be at no other expense than the pay of the commissioner and surveyor, according to law.

ART. 8.—To each Family, included in the contract, referred to in Art. 2, shall be given one Day of water, and one Labor of land, [177 acres] or two if the land is temporal, [cannot be irrigated] and a Town lot of 70 yards square, on which they shall build a house, within two years, under pain of forfeiture of their privilege. Should they possess over one hundred head of stock—either of cattle or horses—or six hundred head of small stock, they shall be entitled to a Sitio [4428 acres] of pasture land.

ART. 9.—A square of land, which on each side measures one League, of 5000 Varas—or, what is the same, an area or superficies of 25,000,000 square varas—shall be called a Sitio; and this shall be the unit for counting one, two, or more Sitios;—as, likewise, the unit for counting one, two, or more Labors, shall be one million square varas, or one thousand varas on each side, which shall constitute a Labor. The vara, for these admeasurements, shall consist of three geometrical feet.

ART. 10.—This Law concedes to the contractors, for each Ninety Families which shall be established in the new settlements, four Sitios of grazing land, and three days of water in each supply that can be used for cultivation of the settlement. But they can take only that proportion for nine hundred families, though a greater number should be established—nor shall they have the right to any premium for any fraction, not reaching to ninety.

ART. 11.—No Commissioner, nor any other authority, can give to the same person a second Lot, unless he shall have built upon the first.

ART. 12.—The contractor who, on account of the Families he shall establish, shall acquire, according to Art. 10, more than Eleven Sitios, must dispose of the excess within nine years. And if he does not do so, the respective civil authorities shall put it up at public auction, and pay over to the owners the net proceeds, deducting the expenses of the sale.

ART. 13.—The Government can sell, to Mexicans, such lands as they wish,—with the proviso, that no single person obtain more than eleven Sitios, and under the express

condition, that the purchaser have introduced into said lands, by the fourth year of his purchase, at the least Thirty head of large, and Two hundred head of small cattle, for each Sitio. The purchaser shall pay into the Treasury of the state, or wherever the Government shall direct, at the time of sale, the fourth part of the land sold; and the three remaining parts shall be paid the second, third, and fourth years, respectively, under penalty of forfeiting his right to any part, and losing the whole by his failure to comply with this arrangement.

ART. 14.—The price of each Sitio, within ten leagues in a straight line from the shores of the gulf of Mexico, shall be Two Hundred Dollars, if it be of grazing land, and Three Hundred, if of temporal. In the rest of the Department of Bejar, the value shall be One hundred Dollars, if it be of grazing land, and One Hundred and Fifty, if of temporal. And in the other commons of the State, the value shall be Fifteen Dollars, for grazing land, and Twenty, for temporal.

ART. 15.—The Government will sell to Mexicans, alone, the land which, by its local situation, will admit of irrigation, and shall not be marked out for settlements, at Three Hundred Dollars each Sitio, in the Department of Bejar,—and in other parts of the State at Two Hundred Dollars,—according to the terms in Art. 13, on the express condition, that by the fourth year from the purchase, the purchaser shall have the eighth part of the land under cultivation—observing the same rule with respect to the temporal lands as mentioned in the foregoing article.

ART. 16.—There shall be no variation in regard to the contracts which the Government shall have entered into, nor in the grants which it shall have made to purchasers or settlers, in virtue of the Decree, No. 16, of 24th March, 1825; but care shall be taken that those who shall have purchased, within eighteen months after the publication of this law, enter into possession of the lands granted to them.

Upon those of the former class, who shall hereafter make new contracts, or shall hold new grants in the way of purchase, (i. e. in virtue of the Decree No. 16, of the 24th March, 1825,) it shall be obligatory to make, within eighteen months from the execution of their respective contracts, settlements on their lands of one-sixth part of the families stipulated in their said contracts; and those of the second class (to wit, those who shall have purchased within eighteen months after the publication of this law) shall, within the period specified in their contracts, actually enter into possession of the lands, under the penalty of forfeiting them by not observing this regulation.

ART. 17.—Every new settlement shall be free from all contributions, whatever, for the space of ten years from the time of its establishment, except such as shall be laid, generally, to prevent or repel foreign invasion.

ART. 18.—The Families which shall, at their own expense, remove to any of the new settlements, and wish to establish themselves in any of them, can do so at any time; and shall therefore be entitled to the benefits granted by this law to new settlers; for which purpose they shall present themselves to the Commissioner, or, in his absence, to the respective civil authority, in order that, by making themselves known to the Government, they may receive their grants in due form.

ART. 19.—No new settler, whether Mexican or Foreigner, shall sell, or alienate in any manner, or under any pretext, the water or land in his possession, until after having entered upon and possessed the same during six years.

ART. 20.—A Mexican or a Foreigner, who shall undertake to colonize with foreign families, whose introduction is not prohibited by the general law, of 6th April, 1830, shall be entitled to the benefits conceded in Art. 10, of this law.

ART. 21.—The division of the land and water to foreign families, as set forth in Articles 18 and 20, shall be made in conformity to Art. 8, provided the conditions required by this law are complied with—they paying to the State *one third less price* than is set forth in Art. 14, in the following terms: One-half of the value in two years from taking possession, and the balance in six years.

ART. 22.—To such Families, as are referred to in the preceding article, shall be given half a Sitio of grazing land, provided they possess the number of large and small cattle, required in the second part of Article 8.

ART. 23.—The Ayuntamientos of each municipality shall collect the above mentioned funds, gratis, by means of a Committee, appointed either within or without their body; and shall remit them, as they are collected, to the Treasurer of their funds, who will give the corresponding receipt, and without any other compensation than two and an half per cent. which is all that shall be allowed him; he shall hold them at the disposition of the Government, rendering an account, every month, of the ingress or egress, and of any remissness or fraud which he may observe in their collection; for the correct management of all which, the person employed, and the committee, and the individuals of the ayuntamientos who appoint them, shall be individually responsible; and that this responsibility may be at all times effectual, the said appointments shall be made *viva voce*, and information shall be

given thereof immediately to the Government.

ART. 24.—Foreigners, in order to be admitted as new settlers, must competently prove, before the Commissioner, and on his responsibility, their good morals, belief in Christianity, and good conduct. These indispensable requisites are to be set forth in the Book, Becerro, mentioned in Article 9, of the instructions of 4th September, 1827.

ART. 25.—The Government will take care that, in the Twenty Leagues, bordering on the United States of America, and Ten Leagues in a straight line from the coast of the gulf of Mexico, in the bounds of the State, no establishment shall be made which shall not consist of two-thirds of Mexicans, obtaining, by anticipation, the approbation of the Supreme Government of the Union; to which effect information shall be sent of all proceedings which shall be made in the matter, whether the undertakers be Mexicans or Foreigners.

ART. 26.—In the distribution of lands, native Mexicans shall be preferred to foreigners; and no other distinction shall be made between the former, except what is based upon their particular merit and their services done to the country—or, other circumstances being equal, their nearness to the place where the lands are situated.

ART. 27.—The Indians, of all nations, bordering upon the State, as well as the wandering tribes within it, shall be received in the markets without exacting from them any commercial duties upon their trade in articles of the country. And, if thus drawn, by the gentleness and confidence with which they shall also be treated, they shall, declaring themselves first in favor of our religion and institutions, establish themselves in any part of the settlements which shall be formed, they shall be admitted, and allowed the same terms as other settlers, treated of in this law, distinguishing the natives as Mexicans, and the borderers as foreigners, without exacting from the first any number of cattle.

ART. 28.—In order that there may be no vacancies, between tracts, of which great care shall be taken in the distribution of lands, they shall be laid off in squares, or other forms although irregular, if the local situation requires it; and in said distribution, as well as in the assignation of lands for new Towns, previous notice shall be given to the adjoining proprietors, (if any) in order to prevent dissensions and law-suits.

ART. 29.—The quantity of vacant land which has to be laid out upon the banks of a river, rivulet, stream, or lake, shall not, if practicable, exceed a fourth part of the whole depth of the tract granted.

ART. 30.—If, by error in the grant, any land shall be conceded, belonging to another

individual, on proof being made of that fact, an equal quantity shall be granted, elsewhere, to the person who may have thus obtained it through mistake; and he shall be indemnified, by the owner of such land, for any improvements which he shall have made thereon; the just value of which improvements shall be ascertained by appraisers.

ART. 31.—By Will, regulated according to existing laws, or such as may hereafter exist, every new settler, from the day of his establishment, can dispose of his lands, although they shall not be cultivated: and if he shall die intestate, he shall be succeeded in his lands, by the heirs at law of all his property and rights—in either case, the inheritor performing the conditions and obligations of the principal.

ART. 32.—The lands acquired, by virtue of this law, shall, in no case, fall into mortmain;—and those purchasers, who have obtained a title to any, shall not be at liberty to dispose of them, without first having complied with the requisitions of this law.

ART. 33.—A new settler who, in order to establish himself in a foreign country, determines to leave the territory of the State, may do so, freely, with all his property;—but when once withdrawn, shall no longer hold his lands. And if he shall not before have disposed of them, or if the disposition be not in conformity to Art. 19, they shall remain vacated entirely.

ART. 34.—The Government, in agreement with the ordinary ecclesiastics, will be careful to provide an adequate number of Pastors for the new settlements; and in concurrence with the same authority, shall propose to the Legislature, for its approbation, the salaries which the said Pastors ought to receive, which are to be paid by the new settlers.

ART. 35.—The new settlers, *in regard to the introduction of Slaves, shall be subject to laws which now exist, and which shall hereafter be made on the subject.*

ART. 36. The *servants and laborers* which, in future, foreign colonists shall introduce, *shall not, by force of any contract whatever, remain bound to their service a longer space of time than ten years.*

ART. 37. The commissioner, or commissioners, which shall be appointed in conformity with this law, shall not be suspended in their functions by any other authority than that of the Government. The Judges, within their own jurisdictions respectively, shall inform of any bad management that may be known.

ART. 38. The Decree of 24th March, 1825, No. 16, is abrogated.

The Governor of the State will understand that this law be complied with:—and he will print, publish, and circulate it.

Given in the City of Leona Vicario, 28th April, 1832.

JOSE JESUS GRANDE,
President.

For MANUEL MUSQIZ, *Secretary.*

CESARIO FIGUERO, *Sec. Pro. Tcm.*

Whereupon, I command that it be printed, published, and circulated; and that it be complied with.

JOSE MARIA DE LETONA.

SANTIAGO DEL VALLE, *Secretary.*

Leona Vicario, May 2d, 1832.

The land-speculations, aforesaid, have extended to most of the cities and villages of the United States, the British colonies in America, and the settlements of foreigners in all the eastern parts of Mexico. All concerned in them are aware that a change in the government of the country *must* take place, if their claims shall ever be legalized.

The advocates of slavery, in our southern states and elsewhere, want more land on this continent suitable for the culture of sugar and cotton; and if Texas, with the adjoining portions of Tamaulipas, Coahuila, Chihuahua, and Santa Fe, east of the Rio Bravo del Norte, can be wrested from the Mexican government, room will be afforded for the redundant slave population in the United States, even to a remote period of time. The following may be taken as a fair estimate of the dimensions of this extensive region, in square miles, and in English acres. It is calculated from the boundaries of the different departments, as marked in Tanner's Map of Mexico, revised in 1834:—

Texas, (proper,)	165,000	104,560,000
Tamaulipas east of Rio Bravo,	13,000	8,960,000
Coahuila, do.	7,000	4,480,000
Chihuahua, do.	9,000	5,760,000
Santa Fe, do.	107,000	68,480,000

Total	301,000	192,240,000
-------	---------	-------------

The breeders of slaves, in those parts of the United States where slave labour has become unprofitable,—and also the traffickers in human flesh, whether American or foreign, desire an extended market, which Texas would afford if revolutionized, and governed as well as inhabited by those who are in favour of re-establishing the system of slavery in that section of country. The northern land speculators most cheerfully co-operate

with the southern slave-holders in the grand scheme of aggression, with the hope of immense gain; and the slave-merchants play into the hands of both, with the same heartless, avaricious feelings and views. The principal seat of operations for the first, is New York;—though some active and regular agencies are established at New Orleans and Nashville, and minor agencies in other places. The second exercise their influence individually, without any particular organization: while the third co-operate with all, as opportunities present themselves. They have subsidized presses at command, ready to give extensive circulation to whatever they may wish to publish in furtherance of their views. And orators, legislators, and persons holding official stations under our Federal government, are deeply interested in their operations, and frequently willing instruments to promote their cause.

Such are the motives for action—such the combination of interests—such the organization, sources of influence, and foundation of authority, upon which the present *Texas Insurrection* rests. The resident colonists compose but a small fraction of the party concerned in it. The standard of revolt was raised as soon as it was clearly ascertained that slavery could not be perpetuated, nor the illegal speculations in land continued, under the *government* of the Mexican Republic. The Mexican authorities were charged with acts of oppression, while the true causes of the revolt—the motives and designs of the insurgents—were studiously concealed from the public view. Influential slave-holders are contributing money, equipping troops, and marching to the scene of conflict. The land speculators are fitting out expeditions from New York and New Orleans, with men, munitions of war, provisions, &c., to promote the object. The Independence of Texas is declared, and the system of slavery, as well as the slave trade, (with the United States,) is fully recognised by the government they have set up. Commissioners are sent from the colonies, and agents are appointed here, to make formal application, enlist the sympathies of our citizens, and solicit aid in every

way that it can be furnished. The *hiring presses* are actively engaged in promoting the success of their efforts, by misrepresenting the character of the Mexicans,* issuing inflammatory appeals, and urging forward the ignorant, the unsuspecting, the adventurous, and the unprincipled, to a participation in the struggle.

In the course of my observations, I have several times asserted, that it was the intention of the insurrectionists to establish and perpetuate the system of slavery, by “*Constitutional*” provision. In proof of this, I now quote several paragraphs from the Constitution which they lately adopted. This extract is taken from that part under the head of “General Provisions,” and embraces all that relates to slavery. We remember the proclamation of D. G. Burnet, the President of their assumed government, issued a few months since, setting forth that their Constitution *prohibited the “slave trade,”* &c.† That “proclamation” was circu-

*For the purpose of exciting the *sympathy* of the people of the United States, the marauders who are engaged in the Texas insurrection have represented the Mexicans as a blood-thirsty race; while they have themselves, by their *piratical* acts, excited the vengeance of a people with whom their own government is professedly at peace. Some instances of severe retribution have been visited upon them; but most, if not all, of the charges preferred against the Mexicans, as respects their faithlessness and cruelty, are sheer falsehoods. Much has been said about the execution of Fanin and his band of Georgia volunteers. By the *laws* of Mexico (which had been published in this country before they left home) they were considered precisely in the light of pirates. The laws of nations also present them in the same light, and they were treated accordingly. In a moral view, this was their true character,—for their chief object was oppression and the plunder of a people who had never offended them. We have been told that terms of capitulation were granted them, by which their lives were to be spared. This the Mexican Generals have promptly and positively denied; and we have more reason to credit their assertions, than those of persons engaged in piratical enterprises.

†When the Convention (so called) was assembled at San Filipe to draft a State Constitution, David G. Burnet introduced the resolution condemning the Cuba slave trader, to which I have before adverted. Then, as

lated for the special purpose of deceiving the opponents of slavery in the United States and inducing them to join in their marauding crusade. It will now be seen, that the measure was a device of the most hypocritical complexion. This extract will also be found to contain much that is fully confirmatory of what I have before stated, upon other topics connected with the general subject before us.

SEC. 6. All free white persons who shall emigrate to this Republic, and who shall, after a residence of six months, make oath before some competent authority that he intends to reside permanently in the same, and shall swear to support this Constitution, and that he will bear true allegiance to the Republic of Texas, shall be entitled to all the privileges of citizenship.

SEC. 7. So soon as convenience will permit, there shall be a penal code formed on principles of reformation, and not of vindictive justice; and the civil and criminal laws shall be revised, digested, and arranged under different heads; and all laws relating to land titles shall be translated, revised, and promulgated.

SEC. 8. All persons who shall leave the country for the purpose of evading a participation in the present struggle, *or shall refuse to participate in it, or shall give aid or assistance to the present enemy, shall forfeit all rights to citizenship, and such lands as they may hold, in the Republic.*

SEC. 9. All persons of color, who were slaves for life previous to their emigration to Texas, and who are now held in bondage, shall remain in the like state of servitude, provided the said slave shall be the bona fide property of the person so holding said slave as aforesaid. *Congress shall pass no laws to prohibit emigrants from the United States of America from bringing their slaves into the Republic with them, and holding them by the same tenure by which such slaves were held in the United States; nor shall Congress have the power to emancipate slaves; nor shall any slave-holder be allowed to emancipate his or her slave or slaves, without the consent of Congress, unless he or she shall send his or her slave or slaves without the limits of the Republic. No free person of African descent, either in whole or in part, shall be permitted to reside permanently in the Republic, without the consent of Congress; and the importation or admission of Africans or negroes into this Republic, excepting from the United States of America, is forever prohibited, and declared to be piracy.*

SEC. 10. All persons, (*Africans, the descendants of Africans, and Indians excepted,*) who were residing in Texas on the day of the De-

claration of Independence, [A great portion of the native Mexican citizens are, of course, excluded.] shall be considered citizens of the Republic, and entitled to all the privileges of such. All citizens now living in Texas who have not received their portion of land, in like manner as colonists, shall be entitled to their land in the following proposition and manner: Every head of a family shall be entitled to one league and "labor" of land, and every single man of the age of seventeen and upwards, shall be entitled to the third part of one league of land. All citizens who may have, previously to the adoption of this Constitution, received their league of land as heads of families, and their quarter of a league of land as single persons, shall receive such additional quantity as will make the quantity of land received by them equal to one league and "labor" and one-third of a league, unless by bargain, sale, or exchange, they have transferred, or may henceforth transfer their right to said land, or a portion thereof, to some other citizen of the Republic; and in such case the person to whom such right shall have been transferred, shall be entitled to the same, as fully and amply as the person making the transfer might or could have been. No alien shall hold land in Texas, except by titles emanating directly from the Government of this Republic. But if any citizen of this Republic should die intestate or otherwise, his children or heirs shall inherit his estate, and aliens shall have a reasonable time to take possession of and dispose of the same, in a manner hereinafter to be pointed out by law. Orphan children, whose parents were entitled to land under the colonization law of Mexico, and who now reside in the Republic, shall be entitled to all the rights of which their parents were possessed at the time of their death. The citizens of the Republic shall not be compelled to reside on the land, but shall have their lines plainly marked.

All orders of survey legally obtained by any citizen of the Republic, from any legally authorized commissioner, prior to the act of the late consultation closing the land offices, shall be valid. In all cases the actual settler and occupant of the soil shall be entitled, in locating his land, to include his improvement, in preference to all other claims not acquired previous to his settlement, according to the law of the land and this Constitution: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prejudice the rights of any citizen from whom a settler may hold land by rent or lease.

And whereas the protection of the public domain from unjust and fraudulent claims, and quieting the People in the enjoyment of their lands is one of the great duties of this Convention: and whereas the Legislature of

the State of Coahuila & Texas having passed an act in the year eighteen hundred and thirty-four, in behalf of General John T. Mason, of New York, and another on the fourteenth day of March, eighteen hundred and thirty-five, *under which the enormous amount of eleven hundred leagues of land has been claimed by sundry individuals, some of whom reside in foreign countries, and are not citizens of the Republic, which said acts are contrary to articles fourth, twelfth, and fifteenth, of the laws of eighteen hundred and twenty-four, of the General Congress of Mexico, and one of said acts for that cause has, by the said General Congress of Mexico, been declared null and void:* it is hereby declared that the said act of eighteen hundred and thirty-four, in favour of John T. Mason, and of the fourteenth of March, eighteen hundred and thirty-five, of the said Legislature of Coahuila & Texas, and each and every grant founded thereon, is, *and was from the beginning,* null and void; and all surveys made under pretence of authority derived from said acts are hereby declared to be null and void; and all eleven-league claims, located within twenty leagues of the boundary line between Texas and the United States of America, which have been located contrary to the laws of Mexico, are hereby declared to be null and void: and whereas many surveys and titles to land have been made whilst most of the people of Texas were absent from home, serving in the campaign against Bejar, it is hereby declared that all the surveys and locations of land made since the act of the late consultation closing the land offices, and all titles to land made since that time, are and shall be null and void.

The adoption of a Constitution with such provisions as are here quoted, may be termed the crowning act—the finishing stroke of this monstrous scheme of oppression, so far as the *expressed will* of those concerned in it can be manifested by conventional regulation. When we look back to the commencement of their operations, and trace their movements step by step, bearing in mind their open declarations upon various occasions, what man of reason and common sense can, for one moment, doubt that the re-establishment of Slavery has been their principal object, their settled determination, from the beginning? I think it will be admitted, by every person of penetration, reflection, and unbiassed judgment, that the evidence I have produced is conclusive on this point. I might state many more facts and circumstances, which have

come to my knowledge during a long and intimate acquaintance with their proceedings, all tending to the same conclusion. My intercourse with many of the actors in the great drama, has given me numerous opportunities to understand their motives and their designs. It is indeed impossible that I should be mistaken in the one or the other. And as unfolding events coincide fully with my assertions, and with the proofs already adduced to sustain them, it might be considered unnecessary to dwell longer upon this particular topic. Yet, in order that the reader may lack no important information, that will show the decided stand which the Mexican government has taken against the toleration of slavery, I will quote a few more official documents, (to some of which I have heretofore alluded) in verification of what I have asserted, and already perhaps sufficiently proved.

The following decrees and ordinances are translated from an official compilation, published by authority of the Mexican Government, embracing all the public acts of said government from the period of its organization to the year 1830.—

DECREE OF JULY 13, 1824.

Prohibition of the Commerce and Traffic in Slaves.

The Sovereign General Constituent Congress of the United Mexican States has held it right to decree the following:

1. The Commerce and Traffic in Slaves, proceeding from whatever power, and under whatever flag, is for ever prohibited, within the territories of the United Mexican States.

2. The Slaves, who may be introduced contrary to the tenour of the preceding article, shall remain free in consequence of treading the Mexican soil.

3. Every vessel, whether National or Foreign, in which Slaves may be transported and introduced into the Mexican territories, shall be confiscated with the rest of its cargo—and the Owner, Purchaser, Captain, Master, and Pilot, shall suffer the punishment of ten years confinement.

4. This law will take effect from the date of its publication; however, as to the punishments prescribed in the preceding article, they shall not take effect till six months after, towards the Planters who, in virtue of the law of the 14th October last, relating to the Colonization of the Isthmus of Guazacoalco, and may disembark Slaves for the purpose

of introducing them into the Mexican territory.

(See the 21st Article of the Decree of October 11, 1823.)

DECREE

Of the 18th of December, 1824, upon Colonization.

The Sovereign General Constituent Congress of the United States of Mexico, have resolved and do fully decree :

1. The Mexican nation offer to Foreigners who come to establish themselves in their territory, security in their persons and in their property, provided they subject themselves to the laws of the country.

2. This law applies to those territories of the nation which, not being individual property nor belonging to any Corporation or Town, may be colonized.

3. For this purpose the Congresses of the States will form, with the greatest brevity, the laws or regulations of colonization, of their respective demarcation, conforming themselves in all cases to the regulations established by this law.

4. It is not permitted to colonize the territories within twenty leagues of the boundaries of any foreign nation, nor within ten leagues bordering on the sea coast, without the previous approbation of the supreme general executive power.

5. If, for the defence or security of the nation, the Government of the Federation should find it convenient to make use of some portion of these lands, to construct magazines, arsenals, or other public buildings, the same may be verified with the approbation of the general Congress, or during its recess with that of the Council of Government.

6. It is not permitted before four years from the publication of this Law, to impose any duty upon the importations, for their own use, by foreigners, who may establish themselves for the first time in the country.

7. Before the year 1840, the general Congress cannot prohibit the entrance of foreigners, to colonize, unless imperious circumstances oblige them to do so with respect to individuals of any nation.

8. The Government, without prejudice to the object of this Law, shall take, in regard to the foreigners who come to colonize, the precautions which they may judge suitable for the security of the Federation.

9. A preference must be attended to in the distribution of lands to the Mexican citizens; and no distinction must be made betwixt than except what particular merit and services done to the Country, may give them a right to. Circumstances being equal, a preference will be given to those who have lands in the neighbourhood of the territory to be distributed.

10. The Military who with reference to

the offer of the 27th March 1821, may hold a right to lands, shall be attended to in the States, on shewing the certificates which the superior executive power may have given them for this purpose.

11. If by the decrees of capitulation according to the probabilities of life the supreme executive power should find it convenient to alienate certain portions of land in favour of certain Officers of the Federation whether military or civil, the same may be ratified in the registers of the territory.

12. It is not permitted that there should be held in property by one individual more than one square league of five thousand rods of meadow land, four of secular land, six of pasture.

13. The new settlers are not permitted to leave their property in entail.

14. This Law guarantees the contracts which "Empresarios" may have made with the Families whom they bring on at their own expense; it being always understood that these contracts are not contrary to the Laws.

15. No one who by virtue of this Law may acquire landed property can preserve it if settled permanently out of the territories of the republic.

16. The government, in conformity with the principles established in this Law, shall proceed to the colonization of the territories of the Republic.

(See the order of the 11th April 1823, and the Decree of the 14th Oct. 1823.)

[Translated from Vol. 2. page 94, Mexican Laws.]

NOTE. In an Order of the 11th of April, [1823] notice is given to Government that if it find no inconvenience, it may yield to the solicitation of Stephen F. Austin, in confirming to him the Grant for settling Three Hundred Families in Texas, and it can moreover, decide upon other applications of a similar nature, and cause to be suspended till further determination, the law of Colonization enacted by the *Junta Instituyente*.

[Translated from Vol. 2, page 199, Mexican Laws.]

Extract from the Law of 14th October, 1823.

Article 21. Foreigners who bring slaves with them, shall obey the Laws established upon the matter, or shall hereafter be established.

(See the Decree of 13th July, 1824.)

[Translated from page 149, Vol. 5, Mexican Laws.]

DECREE OF PRESIDENT GUERRERO.

Abolition of Slavery.

The President of the United Mexican States, to the inhabitants of the Republic.—

Be it known : That in the year 1829, being desirous of signalizing the anniversary of our Independence by an Act of national Justice

and Beneficence, which may contribute to the strength and support of such inestimable welfare, as to secure more and more the public tranquillity, and reinstate an unfortunate portion of our inhabitants in the sacred rights granted them by Nature, and may be protected by the Nation under wise and just Laws, according to the Provision in Article 30 of the Constitutive Act; availing myself of the extraordinary faculties granted me, I have thought proper to Decree :

1. That slavery be exterminated in the Republic.

2. Consequently those are free, who, up to this day, have been looked upon as slaves.

3. Whenever the circumstances of the Public Treasury will allow it, the owners of slaves shall be indemnified, in the manner which the Laws shall provide.

Mexico 15 Sept. 1829, A. D.

JOSE MARIA de BOCANEGRA.

[Translation of part of the Law of April 6th, 1830, prohibiting the migration of citizens of the United States to Texas.]

ART. 9. On the northern frontier the entrance of foreigners shall be prohibited, under all pretexts whatever, unless they be furnished with passports, signed by the agents of the Republic, at the places whence they proceed.

ART. 10. There shall be no variation with regard to the colonies already established, nor with regard to the slaves that may be in them; but the General Government, or the particular State Government, *shall take care, under the strictest responsibility, that the colonization laws be obeyed, and that no more slaves be introduced.*

ART. 11. In use of the power reserved by the General Congress in the 7th Article of the law of August 18th, 1824, it is prohibited to neighbouring nations to settle in those States and Territories of the federation which border on their nations. Consequently, contracts which have not been executed, and are opposed to that law, shall be superceded.

I have said that the present contest in Texas has assumed a character which must seriously affect both the interests and the honor of this nation; and that the policy and measures of the government are deeply involved in it. I do not say that the government has *officially* committed itself upon the question.— This has been most studiously avoided, while it has been completely under the influence of the "*Combination*," engaged in the outrageous "*crusade*," and has given *efficient aid* by a tacit acquiescence therein, as far as it could possibly be done consistently with the preservation of even the *shadow* of "*neutrality*."

When a Mexican national vessel was taken into New Orleans, by the piratical expedition from that place, a mere *mock-trial* was instituted against those violators of our treaty with Mexico and the law of nations. Armed bands have been *permitted* to proceed from different parts of the United States *openly* and *avowedly*, to join in the contest, without the least degree of molestation; and even when complaints have been officially made by accredited Mexican agents, nothing has been done to arrest them except the *formal* transmission of orders to the District Attornies, to which they paid not the slightest attention.

In addition to this positive neglect or refusal to enforce the neutral obligations of the nation, a claim has been set up— (a claim the most preposterous that can be imagined—) to a large extent of Mexican territory, with the view of placing an armed force in the vicinity of the combatants to over-awe the Mexican troops and afford opportunities to aid the insurgents.*

A false construction has also has been given to a clause in the treaty between the two governments, in relation to the restriction of the Indian tribes within their respective limits, by virtue of which a large force has been ordered to the frontiers under the *pretence* of enforcing the provisions of said treaty. It is well understood that these troops, collected from among the advocates of slavery in the south-western States, will not remain inactive, "*neutral*" spectators, when the crisis arrives in which their participation in the contest may be desirable to the instigators of the war. I do not stand alone in the view which is here taken of the subject. By a reference to the speech of John Quincy Adams, from which I have heretofore made some extracts, it will be seen that similar ideas are expressed by him; and it may be added, that many of the most intelligent men among us are fully convinced of of their general correctness.

The following is the Article in the Treaty, under the authority of which our

* One of the deep laid plans of the *combination* was, to send their "*volunteers*" to the frontier, through the agency and at the *expense* of the government.

Government has instructed Gen. Gaines to cross the boundary line. Who can perceive the warrant that it is supposed to give either party, to go beyond the limits of its own territory with an armed force?—And further,—what authority does it give either, to prevent the Indians from joining the one or the other, *as friendly allies*?

“ART. 33. It is likewise agreed that the two contracting parties shall, by all the means in their power, maintain peace and harmony among the several Indian nations who inhabit the lands adjacent to the lines and rivers which form the boundaries of the two countries; and the better to attain this object, both parties bind themselves expressly to restrain, by force, all hostilities and incursions on the part of the Indian nations being within their respective boundaries: so that the United States of America will not suffer their Indians to attack the citizens of the United Mexican States, nor the Indians inhabiting their territory; nor will the United Mexican States permit the Indians residing within their territories to commit hostilities against the citizens of the United States of America, nor against the Indians residing within the limits of the United States, in any manner whatever.

And in the event of any person or persons captured by the Indians who inhabit the territory of either of the contracting parties, being or having been carried into the territories of the other, both Governments engage and bind themselves in the most solemn manner to return them to their country, as soon as they know of their being within their respective territories, or to deliver them up to the agent or representative of the Government that claims them, giving to each other, reciprocally, timely notice, and the claimant paying the expenses incurred in the transmission and maintenance of such person or persons, who, in the meantime, shall be treated with the utmost hospitality by the local authorities of the place where they may be.—Nor shall it be lawful, under any pretext whatever, for the citizens of either of the contracting parties to purchase or hold captive prisoners made by the Indians inhabiting the territories of the other.”

Under the erroneous construction of the treaty, aforesaid, Gen. Gaines was authorized to cross the boundary line with his army; to *March seventy miles* into the Mexican territory; and to occupy the military post of Nacogdoches, *in case he should judge it expedient in order to guard against Indian depredations!*—And further; he was likewise

authorized to call upon the Governors of several of the *south-western States* for an additional number of troops, *should he consider it necessary.*

In order to furnish an excuse for the exercise of the authority thus delegated to him, many false rumours of Indian depredations and hostile movements were reported to the Commander of the United States forces, and he did not neglect the occasion for pushing to the *very extent* of his *conditional* instructions.—(His proceedings in this case are of so recent date, that they must be familiar to every intelligent reader, and need not be here specified.)—He even went so far, that the Executive became alarmed, *lest the “neutrality” of our Government should be violated!!*—and his requisitions upon the governors of Tennessee and Kentucky were countermanded. Yet he is still permitted to keep an imposing force stationed in the Mexican territory; and it is understood that he is in regular correspondence with the chiefs of the insurgent armies; also that his men are “deserting” and joining them in great numbers.*

The insurrectionists are thus indirectly encouraged, and *assisted*, by our Government.—And the hope is entertained, by those concerned, that the efforts of the Mexicans may be thus paralyzed, and the possession of the territory retained by the revolutionists, until the next meeting of the Congress of the United States, when the independence of the *Texian Republic* may be formally

* In stating these facts, it may be well to accompany them with the *proof*—and here it is.—How well the plan is devised!—How completely the system works!—What undeniable evidence, too, of a *strict “neutrality” on our part!!!*

From the Pensacola Gazette.

About the middle of last month, General Gaines sent an officer of the United States army into Texas to reclaim some deserters. He found them already enlisted in the Texian service to the number of *two hundred*. They still wore the uniform of our army, but refused, of course, to return. The commander of the Texian forces was applied to, to enforce their return; but his only reply was, that the soldiers might go, but he had no authority to send them back. This is a new view of our Texian relations.

acknowledged, and soon thereafter admitted, as an "Independent State," into this confederacy. This the "Combination" is fully determined upon. It is the *ultimatum* of their grand design. I repeat that its *members have a majority in the councils of the nation*; and as the sentiments of the Executive Head coincide with theirs, *the government is completely under their controlling influence*; and their object will certainly be accomplished, **UNLESS THE PEOPLE OF OUR FREE STATES AROUSE FROM THEIR APATHY**, and by an open, decided, general expression of their sentiments, induce their Senators and Representatives in Congress to oppose the measure.

It is indeed astonishing, that many intelligent persons in this country have so long suffered themselves to be blinded and deceived, in relation to this subject. I am aware that the parties to the unholy compact have uniformly veiled their designs with specious pretexts and systematic misrepresentations. But within the last few months, particularly, they have nearly thrown off the mask. Their cloak is a mere veil of gauze; and we have nothing to do but open our eyes, to perceive the hideous reality of the corruption beneath it.

Although it has been generally asserted, and many have been induced to believe, that the only object of the insurrectionists is the establishment of an *independent* government, separate from that of any other,—yet the principal original advocates of the scheme—the *slave-holders, slave-breeders, and politicians* of the United States—never entertained the idea for a moment. The land-speculators and *foreign* slave-traders would have no objection to it; (neither would the colonists object to it;) but they could not expect to effect the alienation of the territory from the Mexican Government without the aid, either directly or indirectly, of the Government of the United States. This aid could not be obtained, without the prospect of the future attachment, *to increase the power and preponderating influence of the slave-holding States in the National Congress*. The plan of establishing an "independent

Republic" in 'Texas was, therefore, publicly proclaimed, first, with the view of effectually separating the territory from Mexico, and firmly re-establishing slavery; and, secondly, to bring it into this Union without subjecting our Government to the charge of official interference in the accomplishment of those objects. *No other plan would have succeeded*; while this has deceived the opponents of slavery, lulled them into a fatal security, and thrown them entirely off their guard, as it respects their own interests and safety. So far as the "combination" has proceeded in establishing its authority, the territory is wrested from Mexico; the system of slavery, and the slave-trade with this country, are fully recognized; and all the necessary preliminaries are arranged for the formal sanction of independence and admission into the ranks of the sovereign slaveholding States composing this Republic, at an early day. This, too, has all been done with the connivance and aid of our Government, *without formally violating its "neutrality."*

If there are any who yet doubt the intentions of the insurgents, respecting the attachment of the territory in question to that of the United States, they are particularly requested to read what follows,—and a moment's reflection will probably then satisfy them of the truth of the averment. It will be perceived that even Stephen F. Austin himself *now* sanctions it openly.

By the recent arrival of a vessel from one of the ports in Texas, a paper bearing date the 9th of August has been received from that country, in which an election for officers of their Government is announced to be held in a short time. Stephen F. Austin is one of the candidates for the Presidency; and in a letter, published in the paper aforesaid, he expresses himself thus:—

Columbia, Aug. 4th, 1836.

Dear Sir—I have been nominated by many persons whose opinions I am bound to respect, as a candidate for the office of President of Texas, at the September elections.

Influenced by the great governing principle which has regulated my actions since I came to Texas, fifteen years ago, which is, to serve this country in any capacity in which the people might think proper to employ me,

I shall not decline the highly responsible and difficult one now proposed, should the majority of my fellow citizens elect me.

I perceive by the proclamation of the President, ordering the election, that the people are requested to say whether they are in favor or not of annexing Texas to the United States. On this point, I shall consider myself bound, if elected, to obey the will of the people. As a citizen, however, I am free to say, that *I am in favor of annexation, and will do all in my power to effect it with the least possible delay.*

Respectfully, your fellow citizen,

S. F. AUSTIN.

The same paper contains the following enunciation from William H. Jack, who recently officiated as their Secretary of State, but is now proposed as a candidate for the Legislature. He writes in answer to sundry interrogatories from those who put him in nomination;—and after replying to three other questions, unconnected with the subject before us, he concludes as follows:—

Fourth. I am decidedly and anxiously in favor of annexing Texas to the United States. I consider it the “*rock of our salvation*,” and a consummation of happiness “most devoutly to be wished for.” Should I be chosen a representative to Congress, I shall leave no effort untried to produce this desired object, feeling confident, that all the blessings of peace and tranquillity, will thereby be secured, to ourselves and our posterity.

Fifth. When I first read the Constitution, as adopted by the Convention, I was of opinion that some errors had crept into it, and hence was in favor of submitting to the people, whether they would adopt it absolutely, or clothe Congress with powers to amend it.

Subsequent reflection, and the importance of organizing a constitutional government immediately, have satisfied me that it ought to be adopted, as it now stands; believing that in the present unsettled state of the country, less injury will result from its adoption than by making amendments at this time.

Thus, gentlemen, I have answered every question proposed, and if my views are conformable to those of the people of this jurisdiction, and they should think proper to elect me, I shall serve them fearlessly and faithfully.

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

WM. H. JACK.

Columbia, 5th August, 1836.

Hear, also, the language of General Houston. The following is from a late No. of the Washington “Globe.”

“Gen. Houston.—The opinion of General Houston is, that Texas, when it shall have

asserted its independence, will seek admission into the Union. He is, himself, *decidedly in favor of that course*, considering it *essential to the interests of the new country*, and of *much importance to the Union.*”

Notwithstanding that Stephen F. Austin (and we may add many other *actual settlers* in Texas) would have preferred a separate *independent* Government, we now see that they have no expectation of establishing one. On the contrary, they unequivocally declare the intention of annexing the country to the United States as soon as it can possibly be done. They could not exercise their *will* in the matter. *The great majority of the fomentors of the rebellion, and the immediate participants in it, ARE CITIZENS OF THIS COUNTRY.* Such of the colonists as were opposed to it, however, have been *compelled* to acquiesce, and the agents of the “Combination” have successfully dictated its prescribed measures, and pursued the course originally contemplated by it.

I have now traced the subject of the *Texian Revolt* through the whole concatenation of its primary causes and objects. I have unfolded to the view of the attentive reader what I *know* to be the motives and intentions of his instigators. I have, by this means, endeavored to undeceive the honest portion of the great American community, who have not had sufficient opportunities to penetrate the veil of their masked designs, and have been imposed upon by their false pretensions. The very acts of the insurgents—even the whole systematic course of their proceedings—prove clearly the correctness of my charges and expositions. It will be seen that, instead of a desire to establish and perpetuate the liberal institutions of freedom and equality of rights, they have taken up arms against the Mexican government from motives of personal aggrandizement, avaricious adventure, and unlimited, enduring oppression. The alarming fact is also clearly and fully substantiated, that the influence of the SLAVE HOLDING PARTY in the United States is now so completely in the ascendant, and so thoroughly sways the deliberations and proceedings of our Federal Government, that it makes it the passive if not the active

instrument, in extending and permanently establishing that horrible system of oppression, even in regions where it had been destroyed by the power of moral virtue and republican principle.

The period has indeed arrived—**THE CRISIS IS AT HAND**—when the wise, the virtuous, the patriotic, the philanthropic of this nation, must examine, and reflect, and *deeply ponder* the momentous subject under consideration. Already we see the newspaper press in some of the free States openly advocating the system of slavery, with all its outrages and abominations.* Individuals occupying influential stations in the community at large, also countenance and encourage it, and even instigate the vile rabble to oppose, mal-treat, and trample on the necks of those who *dare* to plead the cause of the oppressed. At the ensuing session of our national Congress, the great battle is to be fought, that must decide the question now at issue, and perhaps even *seal the fate of this Republic*. The Senators and representatives of the people will then be called on to sanction the “independence of Texas,” and also to provide for its admission, as a **SLAVE-HOLDING STATE**, into this Union. These measures will positively be proposed, in case the Mexican Government fails to suppress the insurrection very soon, and to recover the actual possession of the territory. A few of our most eminent statesmen will resist the proposition with energy and zeal; but unless the **PUBLIC VOICE** be rais-

ed against the unhallowed proceeding, and the sentiments of the people be most unequivocally expressed in the loudest tones of disapprobation, they will be unable to withstand the influence and power of their antagonists. Arouse then! and let your voice be heard through your primary assemblies, your legislative halls, and the columns of the periodical press, in every section of your country.

Citizens of the United States!—Sons of the Pilgrims, and disciples of Wesley and Penn!—Coadjutors and pupils of Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin!—Advocates of Freedom and the sacred “*rights of Man!*”—Will you longer shut your eyes, and slumber in apathy, while the demon of oppression is thus stalking over the plains consecrated to the Genius of Liberty and fertilized by the blood of her numerous martyrs?—Will you permit the authors of this gigantic project of national aggression, interminable slavery, and Heaven-daring injustice, to perfect their diabolical schemes through your supineness, or with the sanction of your acquiescence? If they succeed in the accomplishment of their object, where will be your guarantee for the liberty which you, yourselves enjoy? When the advocates of slavery shall obtain the balance of power in this confederation; when they shall have corrupted a few more of the aspirants to office among you, and opened an illimitable field for the operations of your heartless land-jobbers and slave merchants, (to secure their influence in effecting the unholy purposes of their ambition,) how long will you be able to resist the encroachments of their tyrannical influence, or prevent them from usurping and exercising *authority* over you? **ARISE IN THE MAJESTY OF MORAL POWER**, and place the seal of condemnation upon this flagrant violation of national laws, of human rights, and the eternal, immutable principles of Justice.

*See two of the influential Daily papers in New York—the “Evening Star,” and the “Courier & Enquirer”—with several others elsewhere. Approving of Slavery in all its forms, these corrupt vehicles disseminate the most odious and tyrannical doctrines, in relation to the subject; and as a matter of course, they stand forth among the boldest champions, in advocating and encouraging the marauding crusade against Mexico.

It was my intention to conclude with the preceding observations; but the absorbing interest that has been already manifested among our citizens, induces me to add the following:

We have received accounts of some late and very interesting proceedings in the British Parliament, connected with the important subject before us. These proceedings may well attract the attention of those concerned in the splendid *nefarious* project of converting the Texas country into an immense SLAVE MARKET for the freebooters of America and Europe. The subject increases in importance, as the eyes of the world are opening to the enormity and iniquity of the scheme.

In the House of Commons, June 30th, the subject of the "Revolt in Texas" was thus introduced and discussed:—

Mr. B. Hoy said he was anxious to know from the noble Lord, the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, whether he had received any communication relative to the establishment of slavery and the slave trade in Texas.

Lord Palmerston observed that the inhabitants of Texas were in state of revolt against the Mexican Government, and the result of that revolt was not as yet decided. If the Mexican Government should succeed, they would, of course, enforce their laws on the inhabitants; but if the contest should have another result, and that there should be a separation of Texas from the Mexican Government, and their establishment as an independent power ensued, in such case the laws of Mexico would not be applied. He should, however, state, that no communication could have taken place between Texas and the British Government.

Mr. B. Hoy announced his intention of bringing the subject under the consideration of Parliament.

Dr. Lushington wished to ask his noble friend a question with reference to Texas. He was desirous of knowing whether any information had been received of the importation of slaves from Texas into the United States. Though he believed there was no treaty between this country and the United States which could compel them to put an end to such a system, yet they were bound not to sanction a continuance of such a practice.

Lord Palmerston replied, that no such information had been received by Government.

The London *Patriot*, of July 6th, copies the remarks of John Quincy Adams in Congress, from a New York paper, and makes ample comments upon the

subject in general. The editor observes:

The British public ought to be made aware of what is going on at present in Texas; of the true cause and the true nature of the contest between the Mexican authorities and the American slave jobbers.

Texas has long been the Naboth's vineyard of Brother Jonathan. For twenty years or more, an anxiety has been manifested to push back the boundary of the United States territory, of which the Sabine river is the agreed line, so as to include the rich alluvial lands of the Delta of the Colorado, at the head of the Gulf of Mexico.—There are stronger passions at work, however, than the mere lust of territory—deeper interests at stake. Texas belongs to a republic which has abolished slavery; the object of the Americans is to convert it into a slave-holding state; not only to make it the field of slave cultivation, and a market for the Maryland slave trade, but, by annexing it to the Federal Union, to strengthen in Congress the preponderating influence of the southern slave-holding states.

This atrocious project is the real origin and cause of the pretended contest for Texian independence—a war, on the part of the United States, of unprovoked aggression for the vilest of all purposes.

In alluding to the remarks of Mr. Adams, as before mentioned, the same writer says:—

They ought to enlist the feelings of every British philanthropist, every British Christian, in support of the noble minded men who are standing forward in the United States, to resist the torrent of national iniquity. We call upon the country to raise its voice. Trust not to the smooth words and slow movements of Lord Palmerston. It will be seen from our Parliamentary record, that on Thursday night, the subject of what the papers call the *Revolt in Texas* was mooted in the House of Commons. In answer to the question, whether government had received any communication relative to the *establishment of slavery and the slave trade in Texas*, Lord Palmerston observed, that the inhabitants of Texas were *in revolt* against the Mexican Government, and that, if they succeeded, in such case the laws of Mexico would not be applied. Was this a reply worthy of a British statesman? Mr. Hoy announced his intention of bringing the subject under the consideration of Parliament; and we will take CARE THAT THE SUBJECT SHALL NOT BE STIFLED. Dr. Lushington asked, whether government had received any information of the *importation of slaves from Texas into the United States*? Was the honorable and learned gentleman content with the answer he obtained? We are sure he was not.

At a subsequent meeting of Parliament,

the following highly important proceedings are noticed in the London *Times*.—Although the motion of Mr. Hoy was finally withdrawn, the great interest manifested upon the occasion, both by the mover and Mr. H. G. Ward, who seconded the motion, it may fairly be presumed that *the English abolitionists will not be disposed to let the question rest there*. No man in Europe is better acquainted with the subject than the gentleman last named. His long residence in Mexico, in the character of Envoy Extraordinary, gave him ample opportunity to acquire a thorough knowledge of political affairs, as well as the state of things generally:—and it will be seen that his testimony fully corroborates (as far as it goes) the statements of Mr. Adams, and likewise many of those in the preceding pages of this pamphlet. The observations of Lord Palmerston, though *ostensibly* calculated to neutralize the feelings of the other members, will have a directly contrary effect upon the people of England; and according to his own admission, upon certain contingencies, (should “fresh circumstances” arise) the Government would feel itself bound, or at least authorized, to look to the matter. In what light will it view the *invasion* of General Gaines, and the open, *unmolested* armament and marching of troops, from different parts of the United States, into the territory?

HOUSE OF COMMONS—August 6.

TEXAS.

Mr. B. Hoy rose to bring forward the motion of which he had given notice. It was on a subject of the utmost importance to the cause of humanity, of immense importance to our colonial possessions and to our merchants who had embarked 70,000,000 dollars in Mexico. If the United States were suffered to wrest Texas from Mexico, would not Cuba and other Mexican possessions fall a prey to the United States? The war now going on in Texas was a war not for independence, but for slavery; and he would contend that should the revolt in Texas be successful, that province would still be bound by the treaty, Mexico entered into with this country when Texas formed part of the Mexican dominions, to prevent the carrying on of the slave trade within its territory; the number of States in the Union had originally been 13; they were now increased to 26, and if Texas were added to the Union there could

be no doubt the basis of the connection would be to establish slavery and the slave trade permanently in that province. He begged to ask the Noble Lord opposite, Lord Palmerston, if within the last ten days he had not received an application from the Mexican Government for the good offices of this country to remonstrate with the United States against the gross violation of treaties, and the aggressions of their Southern states.—The honorable member read extracts from speeches of Mr. Huskisson and Mr. John Q. Adams, to show the importance to America in a commercial point of view, of annexing Texas to its territory.

It is now for this house to consider whether, after the enormous sums expended in abolishing and putting down slavery, it would render the whole of that expenditure useless, and to allow slavery to take deep root in situations with respect to which this country had both the power and right of interference in suppressing it. But, supposing the independence of Texas to be established, and that it united itself to the United States, let the house consider what considerable commercial advantages the latter would gain over this country. By that junction, the United States would be brought within six weeks sail of China. Neither ought the importance of the possessions of the mining districts by America be lost sight of by this country. Those mines were of immense value—one alone having produced 30,000,000 dollars. Unless Mexico was assisted as she ought to be by this country, she would be so weakened as soon to become an easy victim to the ambition of the United States of America. The motion with which he intended to conclude was, for an address to the Crown to take such measures as were proper for the fulfilment of the existing treaty, by which this country was bound to co-operate with Mexico. He was of opinion that England ought not only to remonstrate with America, but to have a naval force on the coast to support Mexico against American aggressions.

The Hon. member concluded by moving “That an humble address be presented to the Crown, praying that his Majesty will be graciously pleased to direct that such measures be taken as to his Majesty may seem proper, to secure the fulfilment of the existing treaty between this country and Mexico, and to prevent the establishment of slavery and traffic in slaves, in the province of Texas, in the Mexican territory.”

Mr. H. G. Ward seconded the amendment, which involved a subject upon which he had been long and was deeply interested. The importance of Texas was but little known in this house or by the country. The province itself consisted of a large tract of the finest

land, it had numerous good and only two bad ports, and the possession of it would give to the parties obtaining it the full command of the whole gulf of Mexico. The Mexican Government on its first intercourse with this country, an intercourse of increased and still increasing commercial importance to this country, had stipulated for the abolition in its territory of the slave trade, and he (Mr. Ward) could state that this stipulation had been most rigidly enforced and observed, and he did not believe that there were now in the Mexican states, except Texas, 20 slaves. To Texas the United States had long turned covetous eyes, and to obtain possession of that province had been the first object of its policy. During his residence in Mexico, America contrived to have a proposal made to the Mexican Government, offering 10,000,000 dollars for certain privileges in Texas, and that proposition having been refused, America then proceeded to encourage the settlement of Texas of the refuse of her own southern states, who took possession of the land without title, or pretension to any title, and thus drew into it a population exclusively slave and American. A declaration of independence next followed. That declaration issued from men recognizing no law, and signed by only one Mexican, the President of the Province, a man of talent, it was true, but who had dealt most largely in Texas lands, and sought his own advantage. He was supposed to have formed a connexion with some influential men of the American Cabinet, and amongst them with Mr. Forsyth. What then had followed?—America having created a population in Texas in the way he had stated, and having given to it every possible assistance, a committee of foreign relations in the Senate, came in with a report signed by Mr. Clay, for whom he entertained a high respect, discussing the necessity of recognizing the declaration of the independence of Texas. The tendency of the whole report was to show the propriety, at a future time, to annex Texas to the United States. The question therefore, for the house to consider was—first, the general policy of allowing a state, without remonstrance, to extend itself, and thus put an end to the trade between this country and Mexico—the connexion between which could be completely cut off by a few American privateers ensconced in the Texian ports. The principle had been disclaimed in 1835, when it was proposed to annex part of Cuba to the United States, and that instance ought to guide this country in not allowing this contemplated extension of the American territory. The next consideration was, whether the country would now allow a renewal and an increase of the slave trade? Such would be the result of this policy on the part of Amer-

ica, and from a pamphlet he had received this day, it appeared that the non-slavery states of America had themselves been roused to a sense of their own danger if that policy were successful. It was well known that there had long been a struggle between the slave states and non-slave states in Congress, and parties were equally balanced; but if Texas should eventually be annexed to the Federal Union, 18 votes in Congress at Washington would be added to those in favor of that most degrading feature in the civilized world—slavery. On all these grounds, he most cordially supported the motion of the honorable member from Southampton. (Hear, hear.)

Lord Palmerston observed, that if it at the beginning of the observations he should have to make to the house, he said that he did not feel himself at liberty to agree to the proposal of the honorable member for Southampton, he trusted that neither the honorable member nor the house would imagine that it was a proof that he did not feel the importance of its object, or that his Majesty's Government were not as much animated as was the honorable member with the desire to put an end to the evils to which the address he had moved so mainly related. (Hear, hear.) He (Lord Palmerston) trusted that he should be able to prove to the house that the address moved for was at present in some respects unnecessary, and in other respects premature. The observations of the two honorable gentlemen who had preceded him, divided themselves into two different branches—the one relating to the political part of the question, and the other relating to the trade in slaves.

With regard to the political question, undoubtedly the possibility that the province of Texas might be added to the United States was a subject which ought seriously to engage the attention of the House and of the country, but he did not think that the events which had occurred afforded any ground for supposing that there was any such probability of its occurring to call upon this House to address the Crown with reference to that matter. The state of Texas at present was this—a revolt had taken place there; the Mexican army had been despatched for the purpose of putting it down. The first operations had been greatly successful, but a part of the army having considerably advanced before the rest, it was surprised by the Texian force, routed with great slaughter, and the President taken prisoner. It might be possible that the resistance of the people of Texas might prevail against the authorities of Mexico, but, on the other hand, the numerical strength lay with the army of the Mexican Government, who, from the last accounts that were received, were preparing to make fresh efforts to reinforce their army, and

from what had already happened the final result of the struggle could not be inferred.

With respect to the conduct of the United States of America in the matter, although he was aware that individuals in those States had given great assistance to the revolting population of Texas, yet the conduct of the responsible Government of America was the reverse. If regard were had to the President's Message to Congress, it would be found to contain an unequivocal declaration of that Government to take no part in the Mexican civil war, and that in accordance with that declaration orders had been issued to enforce the laws in the prevention of individuals mixing themselves up in the matter. He (Lord Palmerston) had that opinion of the honor and good faith of the Government of America as not to suppose that they would not act up to that declaration; and he thought fresh circumstances ought to arise before an address should be sent to the Crown on the political branch of the question. (Hear, hear.)

Now, with regard to that part of the question which related to the trade in slaves the honorable gentleman opposite had remarked that no correspondence had been laid before the House with regard to the progress or diminution of the slave trade, supposed to exist in Texas, while other places were given. The fact was so; and the explanation he had to offer was, that his Majesty's Government had no agent in the province of Texas, and they had only lately received information from the British Minister at Mexico bearing on the illicit trade in slaves supposed to be carried on in Texas. It would be a greater evil, much to be deplored, if the course of the civil war were to lead to an extension or re-establishment of slavery. That was a matter deserving the attention of the House; and if the House supposed that His Majesty's Government were either indifferent or unwilling to bestow the most vigilant care to prevent such an evil, he should be willing to agree in thinking with the honorable member from Southampton it fitting to admonish the Government in the manner he proposed; but he (Lord Palmerston) assured the house the Government required no such stimulus to perform their duty, and he thought that what they were now doing might be accepted as a proof that they were anxious and active in endeavoring to put down the slave trade in every part of the world, and to prevent its springing up in quarters where it did not already exist; but he did not think there was any considerable danger of such an evil being the result of the Mexican civil war, for it was evident that either Texas must be conquered and yield to the Mexican authority, or that it, by succeeding in its struggle would become an independent state; or thirdly, add

itself to the United States of America. Now, if the Mexican authority were re-established, no more encouragement to the slave trade would be given in Texas than other Mexican states. Again, if the Mexican authority was thrown off, and the independence of Texas declared, it would then be open to this country to interfere and put down any trade in slaves that might be carried on.—Lastly, if Texas should in the progress of events become a member of the United States of America, though slaves might be sent there from other states, there would be no real danger of the importation of slaves from the coast of Africa, or the islands of the West Indies. He was inclined to believe that an importation into Texas of slaves from Cuba had taken place, but he had not heard of any such importation from the coast of Africa. With regard to the importation of slaves from Cuba, he must say, that it had occurred before the treaty concluded between Spain and this country, for suppressing the slave trade, had come into operation. The statement of the honorable member for Southampton, therefore, applied to a time antecedent to the ratification of the treaty.

The noble Lord then entered into various particulars of the measures taken by the Government with foreign powers for the suppression of the slave trade, and added, if the Government should receive any authentic accounts of the introduction of slaves in Texas, it would be their wish as well as duty, to take such immediate steps as would put it down. Now, as to the political question he thought there were no grounds whatever why this Government should interfere politically. As to that part of the address which called on the crown to interfere to prevent the traffic in slaves in Texas, he thought it would involve a censure on the Government they did not deserve, considering the measures they had already adopted, and on these grounds he must oppose the motion.

Dr. Lushington said there were several circumstances under which this country possessed a right to interfere to prevent the traffic in slaves in Texas. So long as Texas remained in a state of dependence on Mexico, or did not establish its independence, this country had a right to insist on its observation of the treaty which we had made with Mexico, of which under such circumstances, it must be considered as still forming a part. If it did establish its independence, we could recognize it as a state on such conditions as we pleased, and could make the abolition of the slave trade one of them. But if the state was received into the union of the North American states, then we could demand that it should be bound by the treaties which we had contracted with the government of those states.

Dr. Bowring thought we were bound to *remonstrate with the Government of North America against the introduction of any slave dealing state into the Union.*

Mr. F. Buxton expressed his belief that if the Americans should obtain possession of Texas, which had been truly described as forming one of the fairest harbors in the world, a greater impulse would be given to the slave trade than had been experienced for many years. If the British Government did not interfere to prevent the Texian territory from falling into the hands of the American slave holders, in all probability a greater traffic in slaves would be carried on during the next 50 years, than had ever before existed. The war at present being waged in Texas, differed from any war which had ever been heard of.

It was not a war for the extension of territory—it was not a war of aggression—it was not one undertaken for the advancement of national glory; it was a war which had for its sole object the obtaining of a market for slaves—(hear, hear.) He would not say that the American Government connived at the proceedings which had taken place; but it was notorious that the Texians had been supplied with munitions of war of all sorts by the slave holders of the United States—(hear, hear.) Without meaning to cast any censure upon the Government, he thought the House had a right to demand that the Secretary for foreign affairs adopt strong measures to prevent the establishment of a new and more extensive market for the slave trade than had ever before existed. The Noble Lord ought immediately to open negotiations on this subject, not only with the Mexican, but with the United States Government, which latter had always professed to be anxious for the extinction of the slave trade.

After a few words from Mr. Hume, Sir, F. French and Sir J. R. Reid, in condemnation of the proceeding of the Texians, the amendment was withdrawn.

We add a few more facts, collected from various sources, to those already enumerated, tending to prove the determination of southern slaveholders to acquire the Texas country, *for the purpose* of re-establishing Slavery, and annexing the territory to the United States, as aforesaid.

A gentleman of intelligence and veracity residing in Ohio, formerly a member of the Legislature of that State, recently visited the south-western country, and gives the result of his observations upon this particular subject, in a letter to the editor of the *National Enquirer*, as follows:—

“I have read the pamphlet entitled ‘The Origin and true Causes of the Texas Insurrection.’ I was abundantly satisfied on this point before I saw it. No secret is made of it on the Ohio and Mississippi—it is openly avowed, and warmly defended. The colder slave countries feel themselves very deeply interested, and now think of *breeding slaves* in earnest. Men and money will be liberally furnished. Numerous Kentuckians—young men, ambitious of fame, and seeking fortunes—will even go from Illinois, where they had previously emigrated.”

Another very respectable gentleman, who lately travelled with the Hon. Mr. Peyton, of Tennessee, informs us that distinguished *member of Congress* unhesitatingly expressed his determination to use his influence in procuring the annexation of Texas to the United States, in order that a number more Slave States may be created and admitted into the Union, to preserve the preponderance of slaveholding influence and power in the government.

The following items, extracted from *late newspapers*, may very properly be noticed and borne in mind. The “United States Telegraph,” published at Washington City, says:—

“It is stated, on unquestionable authority, that a letter was found among the papers of the late Huchins G. Burton, Ex-Governor of North Carolina, from a person high in authority, stating that Texas would certainly be annexed to the United States,—at the same time offering to make him (Burton) Governor of said Territory. If the statement be true, and *we do not doubt it*, what a state of things does it disclose !!”

The Telegraph proceeds to argue, that the object of the “person high in authority,” was to obtain the *political influence* of Gov. Burton, in the coming election contest. We have not a shadow of doubt respecting the truth of the statement. We have heard it frequently, and can trace it to unquestionably authentic sources. Some noise has also been made about it, recently, in the newspapers. But the subject is not more connected with politics, than with the long meditated, now operative, attempt to provide for the *extension of slavery* to that part of the continent.

The "Mobile Advertiser," of a recent date, holds forth this emphatic language :---

"The South wish to have Texas admitted into the Union for two reasons : First, to equalize the South with the North, and secondly, as a convenient and safe place calculated from its peculiarly good soil and salubrious climate for a slave population. Interest and political safety both, alike prompt the action and enforce the argument. The South contends that preservation and justice to themselves call for that aid to be tendered to them which would be given by the acquisition of Texas. They are not safe as they are. They are not balanced with the free states. Their exposure to insurrection is fourfold, with not one-fourth the means to redress their grievances. They contend that they have an internal foe within, and an awful foe in all those who demand the emancipation of their slaves, and who call upon them to give up their property now and for ever. The question is therefore put by the South to Congress and the country, 'Shall we have justice done us by the admission of Texas into the Union, whenever that admission may be asked by the Texians themselves?' The question is a fair one, and must soon be met by Congress and the nation. The North almost to a man will answer no. The West will be divided, and the discussion of the question will find two strong and powerful parties; the one in favor of Texas, a slaveholding province, and the other against it."

To the foregoing we subjoin a *Toast* lately given at a public meeting of eminent politicians, at Columbia, South Carolina :—

"TEXAS—If united to our government as a state, it will prove an invaluable acquisition to the southern states, and their domestic institutions."

Notices, of the following purport, are very frequently to be seen in the southern and southwestern papers. This is copied from a North Carolina Journal.

"WHO WILL GO TO TEXAS?"

Major J. H. Harry, of Lincolnton, has been authorised by me, with the consent of of Maj. Gen. Hunt, an agent in the western counties of N. Carolina, to receive and enroll Volunteer emigrants to Texas, and will conduct such as may wish to emigrate to that Republic, about the first of October next, at the expense of the Republic of Texas.

J. P. HENDERSON,

Brig. Gen'l. of Texian Army.

August, 1836."

Many more articles might be added, of similar import with the foregoing; but it would occupy too much space to record

them. The paragraph below, however, gives us a view of operations upon a large scale; and while we peruse it, we must recollect, that *no measures have been taken by our government*, to prevent this bold and glaring violation of our own laws and the integrity of the Mexican Republic!

THREE THOUSAND MEN FOR TEXAS.—Gen. Dunlap, of Tennessee, is about to proceed to Texas with the above number of men. The whole corps are now at Memphis. They will not, it is said, pass this way. Every man is completely armed, the corps having been originally raised for the Florida war. This force, we have no doubt, will be able to carry every thing before it.

Vicksburg Register.

It is gratifying to learn, that the motives of those engaged in this outrageous Crusade are beginning to be understood and justly appreciated, by *some* of the most intelligent citizens of the United States.

A gentleman of great philanthropy, intelligence, and public spirit, in the State of New York, thus expresses himself in a letter of recent date :—

"The Texians could have effected nothing, but for the assistance furnished by the southern states, who have as fully waged the war they excited, as though it had been formally declared by them. The number of respectable men in Texas is too small to redeem the country and their cause from the fathomless abyss of misery, degradation, and infamy, into which the projected establishment and perpetuation of slavery must inevitably plunge them as well as the United States. Meanwhile, all the slave-mongers, slave-politicians, and *slave-presses*, on this side the Sabine and Red rivers, are using the utmost exertions to force the recognition of Texian Independence, and its incorporation with the United States as speedily as possible. This monstrous outrage, unsurpassed in the blackest page of history, is fast tending to its consummation."

An able writer in the same State, who ranks among the most eminent legal professional characters, emphatically remarks as follows, in a communication to the editor of the *National Enquirer*.—Speaking of the "Texas Conspiracy," he says :—

"I cannot now bring to my recollection, in the history of the world, so foul and abominable a conspiracy against the laws of nations, of civil society, and the rights of man, as this nefarious combination of land-speculators, land-pirates, and man-stealers, under the name of *Texian Patriots* presents:—and this too in the nineteenth Century, and in the midst of a people who boast of being highly intelligent, and claim to be the friends of law, order, liberty, and the **RIGHTS OF MAN!!!**—From my inmost soul I *sicken* at the thought."

There can be no possible mistake in these indications of an awakening spirit among the intelligent and virtuous of our countrymen. The great question is: Will it be so general as to arrest the grand marplots in their unholy career, before the seal shall have been set to their abominable project? Let the **PUBLIC VOICE BE RAISED, IN TONES OF THUNDER**, from the shores of the Atlantic to our inland seas, and from the mountain-forests of Maine to the swamps of Louisiana.—Let the nation be *thoroughly* awakened, and all may yet be well.—Otherwise, the Demon of Oppression will triumph, and our children must wear his chains—or blood will flow in torrents, and the land be drenched with their crimson gore!

I will now conclude, with one more extract from a late paper. Others are also beginning to sound the tocsin of alarm:—and it is to be hoped, at least, that the **NORTHERN PRESS** will soon be roused to action.

From the "Friend of Man."

The editor of the New-York Sun, of the 22nd, quotes the following extract from Gen. Houston's letter to General Dunlap, of Nashville, "*for a portion of this force we must look to the U. States.* It cannot reach us too soon. There is but one feeling in Texas, in my opinion, and that is to establish the independence of Texas, *and to be attached to the U. States*"—and then remarks:

"Here, then, is an open avowal by the commander-in-chief of the Texian army, that American troops will be required to seize and sever this province of the Mexican republic, for the purpose of uniting it to ours; and this avowal is made by a distinguished American citizen, in the very face of that glorious constitution of his country, which wisely gives

no power to its citizens for acquiring foreign territory by conquest, their own territory being more than amply sufficient to gratify any safe ambition; and in the face, too, of the following solemn and sacred contract of his country with the sister republic which he would dismember:

"There shall be a firm, inviolable, and universal peace, and a true and sincere friendship between the United States of America, and the United Mexican States, in all the extent of their possessions and territories, between their people and citizens respectively, without distinction of persons or places."

In the earlier days of our republic, when a high-minded and honorable fidelity to its constitution was an object proudly paramount to every mercenary consideration that might contravene it, an avowed design of this kind against the possessions of a nation with whom the United States were at peace, would have subjected its author, if a citizen, to the charge of high treason, and to its consequences.—When Aaron Burr and his associates were supposed to meditate the conquest of Mexico, and attempted to raise troops in the southern states to achieve it, they were arrested for treason, and Burr, their chief, was tried for his life. But now, behold! the conquest of a part of the same country is an object openly proclaimed, not in the letters of General Houston alone, but by many of our wealthiest citizens at public banquets, and by the hireling presses in the chief cities of our Union. The annexation of a foreign territory to our own by foreign conquest, being thus unblushingly avowed, and our citizens who are integral portions of our national sovereignty being openly invited and incited to join the crusade with weapons of war, it becomes an interesting moral inquiry—what is there in the public mind to excuse or even to palliate so flagrant a prostitution of national faith and honor in these days, any more than in the days that are past? The answer is ready at hand, and is irrefutable. An extensive and well organized gang of swindlers in Texas lands, have raised the cry, and the standard of "Liberty!" and to the thrilling charm of this glorious word, which stirs the blood of a free people, as the blast of the bugle arouses every nerve of the war-horse, have the generous feelings of our citizens responded in ardent delusion. But, as the Commercial Advertiser truly declares, "Never was the Goddess of American Liberty invoked more unrighteously;" and we cannot but believe that the natural sagacity, good sense, and proud regard for their national honor, for which our citizens are distinguished in the eyes of all nations, will speedily rescue them from the otherwise degrading error in which that vile crew of mercenary, hypocritical swindlers would involve them.

The artful deceivers, however, have not relied upon the generosity and noble sympathy only of our fellow citizens, for they insidiously presented a bribe to excite their cupidity also. They have not only falsely represented the Texian cause as one of pure, disinterested liberty and justice, as opposed to perfidious tyranny and cruel oppression, but they have themselves assumed something more than the liberty which they basely and hypocritically advocate, by impudently promising a fertile paradisiacal piece of Texian land, *a mile square*, to every American citizen and foreign emigrant, who will sally forth to capture it from the Mexican republic! Induced by one or both of these objects, many hundreds of our enterprising citizens left their own ample and unobjectionable country, to unite with Irish, English, and other foreign adventurers in a war, from the fullest success of which, only some six or eight Land Companies, who have fraudulently and audaciously monopolized the Texian territory, would gain an important benefit. And to this shrine of Mammon, concealed by the crowding banners of ostensible liberty, have many hundreds of our gallant youth been treacherously sacrificed—sacrificed by a mercenary treachery, compared to which that exercised by Santa Anna, in defence of the Republic of which he was President, was innocence and patriotism.

Had we in the Texans, a brave and injured people, struggling in the land of their birth, or even of their adoption, for those abstract and social rights of mankind which were the objects of *our* revolution, and which *we* obtained and enjoy, theirs would be a cause with which angels might sympathize, and which the bolts of heaven might well be launched to aid. But is it such a cause?—Deceived by misrepresentations, we were ourselves lead so to consider it, in its earlier efforts; but a fair examination of facts has undeceived us, and we look in vain either for such a cause or such a people in the Texans. What are the facts?

We pledge ourselves to answer the question with a perspicuity which shall defy all future obscurity, and with a rigid adherence to truth which shall defy the most desperate efforts to refute. We have, at present, only room to state, in brief, that the Texian revolution was concerted by the planters and slave speculators in the southern states ever since the first permission given by the Span-

ish authorities to Moses Austin, of Missouri, in the year 1820, to introduce 300 families, professing the Catholic religion, as colonists of a grant of land which he obtained on this express condition. From that time to the present moment the aggressions have been on the part of the colonists, under the sanction of the southern speculators; and not until their purpose of getting a physical force into the province which should detach it from Mexico, and make it a slaveholding state, became flagrant and undisguised, had the settlers, ever received ought but protection, encouragement, toleration and kindness, from the Mexican government. They paid no taxes, had their own laws and tribunals, were allowed to profess and exercise all the religions they chose, though contrary to the Mexican constitution; enjoyed all the fruits of a beautiful and bounteous soil without return or tribute to the government to which it belonged, and were, without exception, the freest civilized people upon the face of the earth. But the object of the colonizing land agents of the South was to make this prolific province their own, and the field of a new and lucrative negro slavery. To this they still tenaciously adhere; and if they can induce a strong force of our American youth to shed their blood for the unjust and avaricious cause of slavery, under the name of Texian liberty and independence, they will undoubtedly secure their object. We doubt not the ability of our gallant countrymen to exterminate any number of Mexicans that can be brought against them, but in fighting for the union of Texas with the United States, which is the avowed meaning of "Texian Independence," they will be fighting for that which, at no distant period, will inevitably **DISSOLVE THE UNION**. The slave states, having this eligible addition to their land of bondage, with its harbors, bays, and well-bounded geographical position, will ere long cut asunder the federal tie, which they have long held with ungracious and unfraternal fingers, and confederate a new and distinct slaveholding republic, in opposition to the whole free republic of the North. Thus early will be fulfilled the prediction of the old politicians of Europe, that our Union could not remain one century entire; and then also will the maxim be exemplified in our history, as it is in the history of the slaveholding republics of old, that liberty and slavery cannot long inhabit the same soil."

PEOPLE OF AMERICA!—Again I entreat you to read, and reflect seriously upon the *alarming facts*, stated in the preceding pages. Let your voice be heard, *immediately*, in the strongest language of reprobation, and denunciation of the **UNHALLOWED SCHEME**.

A CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES.

ERRATA.

A few mistakes have occurred in the haste of printing the foregoing, which the reader will please note, as follows :

In a part of the impression, an error escaped the notice of the proof-reader in the letter of S. F. Austin, *page* 33. In the 23d line from the top, for "Texas," read Bexar.

The first column of figures in the Table, *page* 39, should have been distinguished as square miles, and the second as English acres.

In *page* 40, part of the last note was omitted. The whole of it is here inserted, as follows :—

† When the Convention (so called) was assembled at San Felipe to draft a State Constitution, David G. Burnet introduced the resolution condemning the Cuba slave trader, to which I have before adverted. Then, as now, he wished to *save appearances*; and he succeeded in obtaining a majority to sustain his resolution. But I learned from one of the members of that body, that it was violently opposed by some of them, and passed with difficulty. During the discussion, a motion was offered to *throw it under the table*. This was strenuously advocated—while one, in the fervour of his "republican" *patriotism*, loudly exclaimed : " *Throw it into H—*" !!

Since the pamphlet was put to press, we learn by the newspapers, that the *number* of troops proceeding from Tennessee, under the command of Gen. Dunlap, was greatly magnified, by an error in the account first given by said papers. The actual number was *Three Hundred*, instead of "Three Thousand." The *principle* of the outrage is the same, and the account is admitted to be correct in all the other particulars.

